

BRILL'S STUDIES IN INTELLECTUAL HISTORY

General Editor

A.J. VANDERJAGT, University of Groningen

Editorial Board

M. COLISH, Oberlin College

J.I. ISRAEL, University College, London

J.D. NORTH, University of Groningen

R.H. POPKIN, Washington University, St. Louis-UCLA

VOLUME 110



RESTORING THE TEMPLE OF VISION

Cabalistic Freemasonry and Stuart Culture

BY

MARSHA KEITH SCHUCHARD



BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON · KÖLN
2002

The illustration on the cover is *The Barcelona Haggadah: The Hebrews Building Cities for Pharaoh* (Spain, Mid-Fourteenth Century). British Library, MS Add. 14761 30^v. Published by permission of the British Library.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Schuchard, Marsha Keith.

Restoring the temple of vision : cabalistic freemasonry and Stuart culture / by Marsha Keith Schuchard.

p. cm. — (Brill's studies in intellectual history ; v 110.)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 9004124896 (hardcover)

1. Freemasonry—Great Britain—History—17th century. 2. Great Britain—History—Stuarts, 1603-1714. 3. Great Britain—Civilization—17th century.

I. Title. II. Series.

HS595.A5 S38 2002

366'.1'094109032—dc21

2001059240

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Schuchard, Marsha Keith :

Restoring the temple of vision : cabalistic freemasonry and Stuart culture / by Marsh Keith Schuchard.

—Leiden ; Boston ; Köln : Brill, 2002

(Brill's studies in intellectual history ; Vol. 110)

ISBN 90-04-12489-6

ISSN 0920-8607

ISBN 90 04 12489 6

© Copyright 2002 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

*Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910
Danvers MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.*

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

To Allison Coudert,
Antoine Faivre, and Richard Popkin,
who bring curiosity and generosity
to the scholarly enterprise.

CONTENTS

Preface	ix
Abbreviations	xiii
Introduction	1
Chapter One. Visualizing the Temple: From Jewish Architectural Mysticism to Gothic Masonry (965 B.C. to 1314 A.D.)	9
Chapter Two. Rebuilding the Temple in the North: From Solomonic Mysticism to Scottish Masonry (1128–1513)	61
Chapter Three. Reformation or Deformation? Masonry versus the “Knocking Jacks of the North” (1513–1568)	131
Chapter Four. James VI, “Scotland’s Solomon”: The Making of a “Mason King” (1567–1603)	177
Chapter Five. “Great Britain’s Solomon”: Rebuilding the Temple in the South (1603–1616)	240
Chapter Six. “The Judgement of Solomon”: The Unfinished Temple of Peace and Concord (1616–1625)	311
Chapter Seven. Rosicrucian Vision and the Mason Word: To Build or Break Bridges Across Religious Divides? (1625–1640)	372
Chapter Eight. “Our Hieroglyphic King” and Civil War: <i>Eikon Basilike</i> versus <i>Eikonoklastes</i> (1641–1655)	447
Chapter Nine. “The Theatre of Hieroglyphics”: Masons and Jews Behind the Scenes of the Restoration (1655–1664)	521

Chapter Ten. “The Pleasant Theatre of Naturall Things”:
Rosicrucianism, Freemasonry, and the Royal Society
(1660–1673) 595

Chapter Eleven. From Restoration to Revolution: Masonic
Architects of Tolerance or Tyranny? (1664–1685) 669

Chapter Twelve. James VII and II and the Masonic
Diaspora: The Ruined Temple and the Flight of Knights
(1685–1695) 738

Bibliography 795

Index 827

PREFACE

In a London bookstore in January 1975, I chatted with Dame Frances Yates about the relevance of her pioneering work, *The Rosicrucian Enlightenment* (1972), to my own research on eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Freemasonry. She was amused by my tale of undertaking a Ph.D. thesis in literary history to investigate two provocative questions: why the Irish poet William Butler Yeats argued that William Blake was a Cabalist, Rosicrucian, and Swedenborgian; why the Irish novelist James Joyce portrayed his Everyman hero, Leopold Bloom, as a Jewish Freemason in Catholic Dublin. With a wry smile, she asked if I was prepared for this quest to take a very long time. From her own experience in entering the quicksand of Rosicrucian research, she knew that even deeper quagmires awaited the explorer of “occultist” Masonic history.

Though I completed my thesis, *Freemasonry, Secret Societies, and the Continuity of the Occult Traditions in British Literature* (University of Texas at Austin, June 1975), I knew that I had only begun a process of deciphering Masonic codes and unraveling Masonic politics, which emerged in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries from much older sources. The bizarre figure of MacGregor Mathers, who instructed Yeats in Cabala and Rosicrucianism, epitomized the problem, for he posed as the descendant of aristocratic Jacobite rebels who fled Scotland for France, where they preserved the secret traditions of mystical-military “Celtic” Freemasonry from the eighteenth- into the twentieth-century. In the available books in English on Masonic history, such claims were routinely dismissed as balderdash and rubbish. However, in a steadily increasing number of European publications—from France, Germany, Russia, Sweden, Poland, Italy, and Spain—the “eccentric” version of history espoused by Mathers seemed to gain increasing plausibility.

While concentrating on the infusion of Jewish Cabalism into certain systems of eighteenth-century Freemasonry—especially those that influenced Blake and his Swedenborgian associates—I sought enlightenment from the late Gershom Scholem, who corresponded with me about the possibilities and pitfalls of our mutual interest in the

transmission of Jewish visionary traditions into Rosicrucian rites of Masonry. That the transmission operated outside of orthodox Judaism and “regular” Freemasonry meant that we both had to explore the clandestine underground of heterodox Sabbatian Cabalists and “irregular” occultist Masons and to come up against the stonewall of deliberately suppressed material.

Though the library of the Grand Lodge of London had long been closed to outside scholars, I was fortunate that the late Ellic Howe gained permission for Scholem and myself to use their rich archives. Unfortunately, Scholem became ill and was unable to travel to London, but I have continued to work there, with the encouragement of the librarians John Hamill, John Ashby, and Rebecca Coombes. In the Grand Lodge of Scotland library, Robert Cooper assisted me with the valuable French materials in the Morison collection. In the Grand Lodge of Ireland library, Barry Lyons gave me access to their important holdings. I also worked in the Grand Lodge of Holland library, which possesses rare Sabbatian and Rosicrucian materials retrieved from Nazi confiscations and which welcomes non-Masonic scholars.

Determined to prove or disprove the validity of Yeats’s claims about Blake and his alleged theosophical sources—the Swedish scientist-mystic Swedenborg and the Jewish Cabalist Dr. Falk—I undertook an unexpectedly difficult but rewarding investigation into Swedish political, scientific, and Masonic history which eventually provided a significant key to the Jacobite-Rosicrucian tradition affirmed by Mathers. As a scholar with Presbyterian roots and Protestant-Whig education, I had been misled by the Anglo-centrism and anti-Stuart biases of that historical perspective to ignore or minimize the Scottish, Irish, and Catholic traditions of Freemasonry, which—according to the conventional academic wisdom of the time—was an English institution which originated in 1717 and served Newtonian, Whig causes. However, this “modern” Hanoverian system was not the kind of Freemasonry that fascinated Swedenborg, Blake, Mathers, and Yeats; rather, it was the “ancient” Stuart system that was driven underground in Britain, while it flourished in Europe and the New World.

Guided by the publications of the late Franco-Swedish historian Claude Nordmann, I learned about the decades-long, clandestine support by the “Hat” political party in Sweden (the party of Swedenborg and his family) for Stuart restoration schemes, which were often organized in the Franco-Scottish (*Écossais*) lodges estab-

lished all over Scandinavia and the Continent by Jacobite exiles. Though Swedish Masonic libraries are still closed to outsiders, my examination of the unpublished Stuart Papers at Windsor Castle reinforced Nordmann's thesis about Swedish-*Écossais* Masonic involvement in complex, international diplomacy and espionage throughout the eighteenth century. This multi-national Jacobite perspective forced me to re-examine Frances Yates's Anglo-centric theories on the origins of the seventeenth-century Rosicrucian Enlightenment and to newly examine Scottish, Irish, and Catholic contributions to the Rosicrucian-Masonic movement.

Like myself, who will always be grateful for Yates's fructifying scholarship, David Stevenson used her work as a launching point for his own research into the early Scottish lodges. In *The Origins of Freemasonry: Scotland's Century, 1590–1710* (1988), he utilized Yates's work on the Art of Memory to show how that ancient tradition of architectural visualization became a requirement in the training of Scottish Freemasons. His work enabled me to merge my studies of Cabalistic visualization techniques, which influenced the Art of Memory, into fourteenth- through seventeenth-century "Masonic" history. Moreover, Stevenson's allusion to the 1652 Edinburgh initiation of Hans Ewald Tessin, an architect from Swedish Pomerania, provided important links to the Swedish Tessin family, who transmitted traditions of Stuart and *Écossais* Masonry into the milieu of Swedenborg and his disciples in England, who subsequently exercised a powerful influence on Blake.

Encouraged by the indefatigably unconventional historian of philosophy Richard Popkin, I made contact with Susanna Akerman in Stockholm, who was pursuing similarly "heterodox" research into Queen Christina and the Rosicrucian societies on the Baltic. She and I both profited from the archival research of Adam McLean (Glasgow) and Ron Heisler (London), whose independent scholarship is based on a genuinely disinterested curiosity about esoteric history. At last, it seemed that an internationalized version of Rosicrucian-Masonic history in eighteenth-century Britain might be possible—one that would approach the impressive work in French by Auguste Viatte, René Le Forestier, Antoine Faivre, Pierre Chevallier, Charles Porset, Pierre-Yves Beaurepaire, and André Kervella; in German by Karl Frick, Rolf Zimmerman, and Helmut Reinalter; in Italian by Carlo Francovich; in Spanish by Ferrer Benimeli; in Hebrew by Gershom Scholem and Jacob Katz.

In 1994, when various readers of my dissertation—which achieved a wide international circulation—urged me to publish an up-dated version, I warned them that I would have to make major revisions of the early chapters, which were too dependent on Yates’s work and which would require a new Scottish-Stuart perspective. Over the next years, as unexpectedly fruitful materials emerged on Cabalistic, Hermetic, Masonic, and Jacobite networks in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, I realized that a major scholarly *disideratum* was still the Scottish-Stuart origins of Freemasonry. Thus, this book—which covers the period from Solomon’s Temple through the Stuart diaspora in 1695—functions as a prolegomena to future works on eighteenth- and nineteenth-century occultist Freemasonry in Britain, Scandinavia, and Europe. My aim is to reveal the architectural, technological, religious, and political roots of those rites of Cabalistic, Rosicrucian, Templar, and Swedenborgian Masonry that emerged so mysteriously and operated so powerfully in the international culture of the “Enlightened” eighteenth and “Progressive” nineteenth centuries.

I am grateful to Lord Crawford for permission to use the Balcarres Papers in the National Library of Scotland. At Marsh’s Library in Dublin, I was ably assisted by Dr. Muriel McCarthy; at Sheffield University by Dr. Andrew Prescott; at Emory University by Marie Hansen of the Interlibrary Loan Office. Further acknowledgement must go to the librarians at University College and Trinity College, Dublin; Queen’s University, Belfast; University of Edinburgh; University of Glasgow; Royal Society, London; British Library; Bodleian Library; and Royal Library, Stockholm. I am indebted to early readers of the manuscript—Susanna Akerman, Allison Coudert, John Patrick Deveney, Antoine Faivre, Deborah Forman, Joscelyn Godwin, Matt Goldish, David Katz, and Gregory Johnson—who encouraged me to continue exploring this difficult terrain. My husband Ronald Schuchard has been an amiable companion in the exploration, for he enjoys hearing about the early sources of Cabalistic, Rosicrucian, and Jacobite notions of W.B. Yeats, MacGregor Mathers, and their fellow initiates.

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AH</i>	<i>Architectural History</i>
<i>AQC</i>	<i>Ars Quatuor Coronatorum</i>
<i>CSP</i>	<i>Calendar of State Papers</i>
<i>DNB</i>	<i>Dictionary of National Biography</i>
<i>EJ</i>	<i>Encyclopaedia Judaica</i> (Jerusalem, 1972)
<i>HJ</i>	<i>Hermetic Journal</i>
<i>HMC</i>	<i>Historical Manuscripts Commission</i>
<i>JWCI</i>	<i>Journal of Warburg and Courtauld Institute</i>
<i>MJHSE</i>	<i>Miscellanies of Jewish Historical Society of England</i>
<i>SHR</i>	<i>Scottish Historical Review</i>
<i>TJHSE</i>	<i>Transactions of Jewish Historical Society of England</i>

INTRODUCTION

When trying to decipher the often bizarre symbols and codes in the writings of Swedenborg and Blake, I often found keys in the myths, images, and language of “irregular,” Franco-Scottish Freemasonry. The important work carried out by French scholars of eighteenth-century *Écossais* rites—scholarship which drew on the great Masonic collections in the Bibliothèque Nationale—revealed an imaginative world of Cabalistic, Hermetic, Rosicrucian, Sabbatian, and Swedenborgian symbolism that was transmitted to the artistic circle of Blake in London.¹ The standard histories of “regular” Freemasonry in English provided few credible clues to the origins, provenance, and modes of transmission of this complex “occultist” tradition.² Moreover, the French historians were hampered in their investigations of seventeenth-century Freemasonry by the misleading histories published by Anglo-centric scholars.

The great stumbling block to research on pre-1717 British Freemasonry was James Anderson’s *Constitutions of the Free-Masons* (London, 1723; rev. ed. 1738), the first “official” history of the fraternity, which is a hodge-podge of credulous legends and verifiable facts. A native

¹ For information on the symbolic rites of *Écossais* Freemasonry and their international transmission in the eighteenth century, see Auguste Viatte, *Les Sources occultes du Romantisme* (Paris, 1928); Tatiana Bakounine, *Le Répertoire biographique des Francs-Maçons Russes (XVIII^e et XIX^e siècles)* (Bruxelles, 1940); Jacob Katz, *Jews and Freemasons in Europe, 1723–1939* (Cambridge, 1970); René Le Forestier, *La Franc-Maçonnerie templière et occultiste aux XVIII^e et XIX^e siècles*, ed. Antoine Faivre (Paris, 1970); Antoine Faivre, *L’Ésoterisme au XVIII^e siècle en France et en Allemagne* (Paris: Seghers, 1973); Karl Frick, *Die Erleuchteten* (Graz, 1973); Pierre Chevallier, *Histoire de la Franc-Maçonnerie Française* (Paris, 1974); Carlo Francovich, *Storia della Massoneria in Italia* (Firenze, 1974); José Ferrer Benimeli, *Masoneria, Iglesia e Ilustracion* (Madrid, 1976–77); Gershom Scholem, *Du Frankisme au Jacobinisme* (Paris, 1981); Claude Nordmann, *Gustave III: un Démocrate Couronné* (Lille, 1986); Charles Porset, *Les Philalèthes et les Convents de Paris* (Paris, 1996); Pierre-Yves Beaurepaire, *L’Autre et le Frère* (Paris, 1998); André Kervella, *La Franc-maçonnerie Écossaise dans l’Ancien Régime* (Paris, 1999).

² For histories of “modern” or “regular” Masonry, see Robert F. Gould, *History and Antiquities of Freemasonry*, 3rd rev. ed. (1882–87; London, 1951); John Hamill, *The Craft: a History of English Freemasonry* (London: Aquarian, 1986). Margaret Jacob’s *Living the Enlightenment: Freemasonry and Politics in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (New York, 1991) provides valuable information on rationalist, Whig, Newtonian Masonry and its spread from England into Europe.

of Aberdeen, Anderson was a Presbyterian propagandist for the Anglo-Scottish union and the Hanoverian succession. Though he had access to Scottish and English Masonic documents and oral traditions, he shaped and distorted them to suit his anti-Jacobite political purposes. Despite the difficulty of ascertaining the accuracy of many of his assertions, his statements cannot be ignored by the historian, for many early readers knew the historical figures (or their descendants) whom Anderson claimed were Masons. While he minimized Scottish (Jacobite) Masonic history in order to exaggerate English (Hanoverian) contributions, his claims should be mentioned and evaluated within their historical context. It is still unclear whether his use of terms such as “Grand Master” for early Masons was retrospective anachronism or a derivation from oral traditions.

Though Anderson repeated uncritically the medieval and Renaissance traditions of Scottish and English Masons, his version of more recent (1685–1722) Masonic developments was skewed by his anti-Jacobite political agenda. Thus, the formation of the “modern” Grand Lodge of London in 1717 was portrayed as the beginning of real Freemasonry, with the surviving evidence of earlier Scottish and Stuart developments given such short shrift that it virtually disappeared from the emerging “conventional wisdom” of Masonic history. Thus, in 1972 the English historian J.M. Roberts could confidently assert that “the only definite thing which can be said about Scottish masonry is that it did not come from Scotland.”³ Rejecting the *Écossais* traditions preserved by Jacobite exiles in Europe, he argued that “the idea of masons who strove sword in hand to rebuild the Temple was the taproot of the tradition to become known as ‘Scottish’ masonry, a name which owes much to another of [Chevalier] Ramsay’s flights of fancy,” for Freemasonry was “peculiarly English.”

Despite Professor Roberts’s commendable effort to place English Masonry in a wider European context, his dismissal of Scottish history led to his frequent rejections of Cabalistic and Hermetic themes as rubbish and nonsense. Thus, he remained puzzled by the persistent Jewish elements within the higher degrees developed in European lodges and by the political charges made against the *Écossais* lodges. For the next sixteen years, the prevailing academic assumption that the Scottish and Stuart claims (made by European Masons through-

³ See J.M. Roberts, *The Mythology of the Secret Societies* (1972; Frogmore, 1974), 45, 53, 110.

out the eighteenth century) were without historic foundation continued to stymie enquiries into the pre-1717 history of the fraternity.

In 1988 the Scottish historian David Stevenson published his breakthrough research on the late sixteenth-century Scottish origins and subsequent Scottish development of “modern” Freemasonry, which he placed within a European intellectual context of serious interest in the occult sciences.⁴ Working from the surviving Scottish documents of operative and speculative lodges, Stevenson filled the frustrating gaps between early Stuart culture, its links with Scottish Masonry, and its preservation within the Jacobite diaspora after the expulsion of the last Stuart king, James VII and II. Stevenson’s doctoral student Lisa Kahler carried this research further into the early eighteenth century and documented the inaccuracies and distortions of the “orthodox” English version of Masonic history, which served Hanoverian-Whig political purposes.⁵ More importantly for my own research, this revisionist history enabled me to trace the eighteenth-century ramifications of *Écossais* Masonry back to their early roots in Jewish and Scottish architectural history.

Stevenson’s illuminating discussions of the role of the Art of Memory—a mnemonic technique of architectural visualization—in the training of operative masons in Scotland provided a missing link to the similar art of visualization practiced by heterodox Hebraic mystics in the Jewish diaspora.⁶ It thus became possible to utilize objective scholarly accounts of ancient and medieval Jewish building practices, guild organization, and stone-technology to build a real-world base for the imaginative flights of visionary Temple-building which appear in Jewish mystical literature.⁷ Reinforced by Elliot Wolfson’s studies of the persistence of “iconic representation and visualization” in officially anti-iconic Judaism, I was able to connect the previously perplexing role of Cabalism in Freemasonry to the

⁴ David Stevenson, *The Origins of Freemasonry: Scotland’s Century (1590–1710)* (Cambridge, 1988), and *The First Freemasons: Scotland’s Early Lodges and Their Members* (Aberdeen, 1988).

⁵ Lisa Kahler, “Freemasonry in Edinburgh, 1721–1746: Institutions and Context” (Ph.D. Thesis, St. Andrews University, 1998).

⁶ Stevenson draws on Frances Yates’s *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition* (London, 1964), and *The Art of Memory* (London, 1966).

⁷ Salo Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, 2nd rev. ed. (1937; New York, 1966); Erwin Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period* (New York, 1953); George Sarton, *A History of Science* (Cambridge, 1959); Mark Wischnitzer, *A History of Jewish Crafts and Guilds* (New York, 1965).

survival of architectural visualization and Temple mysticism in European Judaism.⁸

Perhaps the most surprising thesis of this book is that pre-modern Scotland provided a uniquely “Judaized” culture for the preservation of architectural and Solomonic traditions that were largely suppressed or ignored in other Western countries—especially in Scotland’s southern neighbor and traditional enemy, England. The work of Arthur Williamson on the strange history of the “Judeo-Scots” sheds light on this peculiarly Hebraic national self-image that made Scotland—a land with no public Jewish community—a major repository of rare Jewish traditions.⁹ Moreover, an accident of geological history—the ready availability of “hewable” stone for monumental architecture in ancient Israel and medieval Scotland—provided an unusually *technological* base for similarities of development in Jewish and Scottish national myths.

According to Stevenson, Masonic history has been generally led astray by the prevailing misconception that the emergence of Freemasonry took place in England—“a belief maintained in the face of the overwhelming preponderance of Scottish documentary evidence relating to the process, evidence which is often simultaneously explained away . . . and then used in an English context to make up for the lack of English evidence!”¹⁰ Because the occultist systems of Masonry that survived underground in post-Stuart Britain and that flourished in eighteenth-century Europe developed out of the architectural, scientific, religious, and political policies of the Scottish-descended Stuart kings of Britain, it is necessary to examine those elements of early Stuart culture which were preserved within the secret enclaves of *Écossais* lodges. The vigorous revisionism currently undertaken by historians of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Scotland and England makes possible a new factual context, which sheds light on the deliberately *secret* history of Stuart Freemasonry.¹¹

⁸ Elliot Wolfson, *Through a Speculum that Shines: Vision and Imagination in Medieval Jewish Mysticism* (Princeton, 1994).

⁹ Arthur Williamson, “‘A Pil for Pork-Eaters’: Ethnic Identity, Apocalyptic Premises, and the Strange Creation of the Judeo-Scots,” in *The Expulsion of the Jews: 1492 and After*, ed. R.B. Waddington and A.H. Williamson (New York, 1994), 237–58.

¹⁰ D. Stevenson, *First Freemasons*, 3.

¹¹ For clear summaries of the revisionists’ works, see Maurice Lee, *Great Britain’s Solomon: James VI and I in His Three Kingdoms* (Urbana, 1990); Roger Lockyer, *James VI and I* (1998); Julian Goodare and Michael Lynch, eds., *The Reign of James VI* (Phantassie, 2000); Eveline Cruickshanks, *The Glorious Revolution* (New York, 2000).

With the expulsion of James VII and II from the British throne in 1688, political exiles carried Masonic traditions throughout the “Jacobite” diaspora, where they attracted a startling variety of monarchs, philosophers, scientists, and artists to their supposedly defeated creed and culture. The Hermetic-Cabalistic masques of the Stuart court, which were often designed and constructed by Masons, disappeared from Britain after the “Glorious Revolution,” but they eventually reappeared in the elaborately theatrical ceremonies developed by Jacobite exiles and their local supporters in *Écossais* lodges.¹² The revival of the Masonic “masque” in late nineteenth-century Scottish Rite lodges in the United States is revealed in the recently published paintings and photographs of the scenic designs, theatrical techniques, and illusionistic effects which recreated the Solomonic magnificence and mystical radiance of the early Stuart performances.¹³ The surprising continuity of this Scottish Masonic tradition from royal celebrations in Scotland in the 1590’s to democratic initiations in America in the 1920’s testifies to the enduring fascination of Stuart-Masonic culture.

With the accession of the Elector of Hanover as King George I of England in 1714, Masonic supporters of the Stuarts mounted a decades long, clandestine campaign to regain the British throne. In 1717 a rival Hanoverian system of Masonry was established, which aimed to suppress and defeat that campaign. When the Hanoverian victors in England—and their descendants among Whig historians—wrote the histories of this great cultural and political rivalry, they created their own myth of Protestant progress and toleration, which almost obliterated the Celtic-Catholic-Jewish elements in the opposition’s struggle and which ignored the survival of those elements in an international Jacobite culture. However, the current invigoration of academic Jacobite studies—led by Eveline Cruickshanks, Paul Monod, Frank McLynn, Edward Corp, Bruce Lenman, and Murray Pittock—overturns much of the conventional wisdom about the

¹² For the architectural-masque culture, see especially Vaughan Hart, *Art and Magic in the Court of the Stuarts* (London, 1994). For illustrations of its revival in eighteenth-century Swedish *Écossais* lodges, see *Gold und Himmelblau. Die Zeitloses Ideal* (Abo, 1993). An attempted revival of this culture occurred in Britain in the clandestine Jacobite “Rite of Heredom of Kilwinning” (1741–1800?), but it is unclear how much performance actually took place.

¹³ C. Lance Brockman, ed., *Theatre of the Fraternity: Staging the Ritual Space of the Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, 1896–1929* (Minneapolis, 1996).

Whig-Newtonian-Hanoverian culture that allegedly created “modern” Freemasonry.¹⁴

One of the more controversial arguments of this book is that the Stuart monarchs were not the monsters of religious intolerance so often painted in academic and popular writing in English. Only if Catholics are considered as so marginalized and sub-human as not to count in estimations of tolerance can Stuart efforts at peaceful accomodation with Catholics be dismissed as “Papist” plotting or cynical autocracy. As J.C. Riley observes, “Seventeenth-century Englishmen regarded Papists with much the same suspicion and hatred that Americans held for Communists in the late 1950’s,” though Romanists composed less than 2% of the English population.¹⁵ Maurice Lee stresses that the Stuart kings “never understood the visceral nature of the ordinary Englishman’s feelings about Popery,” which meant that their repeated efforts to establish liberty of conscience were distrusted and mocked.¹⁶

The further misconception that radical Protestants and Parliament were more tolerant than the Stuarts is belied by revisionist research on the status of Jews in Britain.¹⁷ As Jews resident in seventeenth-century Britain recognized, their freedom to remain Jewish—to not acquiesce to Protestant conversionist pressures—was linked to issues of toleration for Catholics. Through examination of connections between “Judeo-Scots” and Stuart Freemasonry, we can uncover the origins of the strange phenomenon of the “Jacobite Jews” and their Cabalistic-Stuart lodge rituals. Moreover, the emergence of religious toleration as the central creed of Freemasonry was rooted in developments among the Stuart exiles and their Jewish supporters in Holland in the 1650’s.

¹⁴ For new perspectives on international Jacobite culture, see Bruce Lenman, *The Jacobite Risings in Britain, 1689–1746* (London, 1980); Eveline Cruickshanks, ed. *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689–1759* (Edinburgh, 1982); Paul Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688–1788* (Cambridge, 1988); Frank McLynn, *Charles Edward Stuart* (Oxford, 1988); Eveline Cruickshanks, ed., *By Force or by Default? The Revolution of 1688–9* (Edinburgh, 1989); Murray Pittock, *The Invention of Scotland* (London, 1991); Edward Corp and Eveline Cruickshanks, eds., *The Stuart Court in Exile and the Jacobites* (London, 1995); Eveline Cruickshanks, *The Glorious Revolution* (New York, 2000).

¹⁵ J.C. Riley, “Catholicism and the Late Stuart Army: The Tangier Episode,” *Royal Stuart Papers XLIII* (Huntingdon, 1993), 2–3.

¹⁶ M. Lee, *Great Britain’s Solomon*, 185.

¹⁷ O.P. Grell, J.I. Israel, and N. Tyacke, eds., *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (Oxford, 1991); David Katz, *The Jews in the History of England, 1485–1850* (Oxford, 1994).

Though the continued strength and great attraction of Scots-Irish-Stuart Masonic culture in the eighteenth century will be the subject of extended discussion in my next books, the creators of that culture in fourteenth- through sixteenth-century Stewart Scotland and seventeenth-century Stuart Britain is the subject of this preliminary work. Because so much of this history has been insubstantially documented and relegated to the realm of oral tradition and anachronistic legend, I have tried to present as much concrete detail and chronological narrative as possible to create a credible, objective, real-world context for the developing “myths” of Freemasonry. Thus, I concentrate on certain themes that define the Stuart Masonic mentality—i.e., Jewish and Scottish architectural mysticism; Jewish and Lullist mnemonic-visualization techniques; Cabalistic and Hermetic sexual theosophy; Rosicrucian and Masonic scientific schemes; crusader chivalry and illuminated knighthood; liberty of conscience and universal brotherhood.

By the end of this long survey, I hope readers will come to feel more culturally at home in James Joyce’s “Nighttown,” as his Jewish Everyman, Leopold Bloom, protects the free-thinking Irish Catholic, Stephen Daedalus, by repeating his Masonic oaths and making the signs of a Master Mason.¹⁸ In the process, Bloom evokes a vision of his dead son Rudy who silently reads a Hebrew text. Readers may even welcome MacGregor Mathers to their real world, for he did not merely invent his fantastic persona—who wears Highland dress, meditates on the Cabala, designs Rosicrucian rituals, and recruits *Écossais* Masons to fight for Scottish independence in the 1890’s.¹⁹ As we shall see, these colorful “Cabalistic-Celtic” characters were acting in a long-running drama that began in ancient Israel and achieved its richest flowering in seventeenth-century Stuart Britain.

¹⁸ James Joyce, *Ulysses*, rev. ed. (1922; New York, 1961), 609.

¹⁹ William Butler Yeats, *The Collected Letters of W.B. Yeats*, eds. John Kelly and Eric Domville (Oxford, 1986), I, 498.

CHAPTER ONE

VISUALIZING THE TEMPLE: FROM JEWISH ARCHITECTURAL MYSTICISM TO GOTHIC MASONRY (965 B.C. TO 1314 A.D.)

The occupation of mason is the exclusive preserve of the Jews.

—Al-Bakri, *Description of North Africa* (1068)

Masonry is a Jewish institution whose history, degrees, charges, passwords, and explanations are Jewish from the beginning to end, with the exception of only one by-degree and a few words in the obligation . . . The beauty and pride of Masonry is its universal character, its tendency to fraternize mankind.

—Dr. Isaac Wise, Scottish Rite Mason,
The Israelite (1855)

In the mid-nineteenth century, the able Masonic historian Albert Mackey attempted to collect all the oral and written traditions of Freemasonry which had accumulated over the centuries. He concluded that many modern Christian degrees of Masonry draw their symbolism from the “ecclesiastical lore of the Papal Church,” but that “Craft Masonry, more ancient and more universal, finds its symbolic teachings almost exclusively in the Mosaic symbolism instituted in the wilderness.”¹ Moreover, “Masonry has derived its temple symbolism, as it has almost all its symbolic ideas, from the Hebrew type, and thus makes the temple the symbol of the lodge.” According to Masonic tradition, Masonry was first organized at Jerusalem by King Solomon and his master-mason Hiram Abif:

During the long period in which the hypothesis [above] was accepted as a fact, its influence was being exerted in molding the Masonic organizations into a form closely connected with all the events and characteristics of the Solomonic Temple. So that now almost all the symbolism of Freemasonry rests upon or is derived from the “House of the Lord” at Jerusalem . . . Each Lodge is and must be a symbol of the Jewish Temple; each master in the chair a representation of

¹ Albert Mackey, *A Lexicon of Freemasonry*, 3rd rev. ed. (1845; Philadelphia: Moss, Brother, 1858), II, 494, 766.

the Jewish king; and every Mason a personation of the Jewish workman.²

Mackey attributed the Jewish element in Freemasonry to “a period of excitement in favor of the rites of Judaism” which pervaded Byzantium and Northern Europe in the early fourteenth-century.³

However, more recent scholarship suggests that the Jewish influence on medieval masonic guilds probably began much earlier and that it was rooted in ancient and enduring traditions of Jewish mathematical and architectural mysticism. Like other Middle Eastern cultures, the Jews had a long history of artisan guilds, of which the early fraternities of temple builders were the most prestigious. In Biblical times, each fraternity had a chief officer who was “exalted over his brothers” and who acted as “father of the Craftsmen’s Valley” (*Chronicles* 4:9–14). The guilds of temple builders were intimately connected with the priesthood, for the temples were designed as magical emblems of the cosmos. Thus, the architects and master-builders had to be deeply versed in the esoteric traditions of the priests, which were generally concealed from the populace at large.⁴

The first master mason mentioned in Jewish tradition was Bezalel, whom God appointed to build the Mosaic Tabernacle. God revealed to Moses on Mount Sinai the design, ornamentation, and ritual of the Tabernacle (*Exodus* 25–28). Significantly, God also revealed the “divine architecture” to Bezalel:

And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, See, I have called by name Bezalel . . . And I have filled him with the spirit of God, in wisdom, and in understanding, and in knowledge, and in all manner of workmanship, to devise cunning works, to work in gold, and in silver, and in brass, and in cutting stones, to set *them*, and in carving of timber . . . (*Exodus* 31:1–5).

Bezalel accordingly taught his stonemasons and artisans how to embody the sacred celestial vision in architectural form. Wischnitzer observes that Bezalel’s role was similar to a medieval “master of the works.”⁵ Like his Gothic counterparts, who honored him in lodge

² Ibid., II, 769.

³ Ibid., II, 370.

⁴ See Raphael Patai, *Man and Temple in Ancient Jewish Myth and Ritual*, 2nd rev. ed. (New York: Ktav, 1967).

⁵ Mark Wischnitzer, *A History of Jewish Crafts and Guilds* (New York: Jonathan David, 1965), 3–4.

ritual, Bezalel was a philosophic and religious sage as well as an architect and craftsman. That Bezalel's attainments as a master mason included occult and alchemical expertise would become a widespread belief in later Judaism and Freemasonry.

In the tenth century B.C., when King Solomon built his great Temple, he drew upon the guilds of Jewish stonemasons, and there is evidence of much fine masonry during the Solomonic era.⁶ But Solomon also called upon Hiram, the Phoenecian king of Tyre, for assistance in building the Temple. Hiram had recently completed a massive building program, which included magnificent temples to the fertility deities Astarte and Baal.⁷ At Solomon's request, King Hiram sent a master workman to supervise the entire Temple project. According to two scriptural passages, the artisan—also named Hiram—was of mixed Phoenecian and Israelite parentage, and he was skilled in stonemasonry, metal-working, woodcarving, engraving, and embroidery (I *Kings* 7:13–51; II *Chronicles* 2:13–14). The scriptures also stress that Hiram's architectural skills derived from a rare “wisdom,” far above the ordinary artisan's: “he was filled with wisdom, and understanding, and cunning to work all works in brass,” and he was “able to build Him [God] an house,” even though “the heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain him.”

The Jewish masons participated in the guild mysteries and ceremonies held by their Tyrian co-workers, and elements of Tyrian fertility symbolism were introduced into the Solomonic temple cult from the beginning.⁸ The free-standing columns of Jachin and Boaz, which served no structural function, probably derived from similar phallic columns in Tyrian temples. The re-emergence of these symbolic columns—symbolizing the physical powers of generation and the spiritual powers of regeneration—in Gothic churches long puzzled scholars, though there is now a consensus that they drew on secret Jewish lore in the medieval building guilds.⁹

After Solomon's death, Israel went through a period of economic and military decline, in which the Temple was periodically despoiled.

⁶ Ibid., 4–6.

⁷ See “Hiram,” *Ej*.

⁸ For this cross-fertilization, see Erwin Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*, Bollingen Series 37 (New York: Pantheon, 1953), IV, 59.

⁹ James Curl, *The Art and Architecture of Freemasonry* (London: B.T. Batsford, 1991), 28–32.

When Nebuchadnezzar ordered the destruction of the Temple in 586 B.C., many Jews viewed the catastrophe as divine punishment for their spiritual deficiencies. Fourteen years later, during the Babylonian exile, the prophet Ezekiel foretold the reconstruction of the Jerusalem Temple (*Ezekiel* 40–48). In a vision Ezekiel saw a supernatural human figure, who would serve as the architect or master-mason of the regenerated Temple. The builder showed him the design, measurements, and ornamentation of the temple. Ezekiel's account of the Temple was preceded by his account of a visionary ascent to the celestial throne world (*Ezekiel* I). Both visions—the celestial journey and the mystical master-builder—became important influences on Jewish masonic traditions.

When the Babylonian exile ended in 538 B.C., great messianic hopes were placed upon the regeneration of Israel's religious spirit, and the Second Jerusalem Temple became the embodiment of the nation's ideals.¹⁰ Under Zerubbabel, Jewish and Phoenecian masons and carpenters worked under the supervision of the priestly Levite class, and the laying of foundation- and cap-stones was carried out with elaborate ceremonial (*Ezra* 3–6). During the next centuries, a universalist cult developed which was centered on the cosmic symbolism of the Temple. Many Jews believed that the fertility of the earth and all its people, as well as the harmony of the universe, was dependent upon the ritual of the Temple. Goodenough argues that by the time King Herod proposed the reconstruction of the Jerusalem Temple in 20 B.C., the great "Temple cultus" had become for many Jews an allegory of a Jewish mystery religion.¹¹ The Higher Mystery, in which the adept rises through the cosmos to a vision of God, was reserved for those who had passed through purification and initiation rites. Among these adepts were evidently the "masters" of the masonic guilds.

In order to carry out his grandiose building program, in which the reconstruction of the Temple would be the key element, Herod gathered a great working force from the craft guilds of the Middle East. The Jewish guilds had become powerful organizations and were recognized as independent legal entities by the government.¹² Only

¹⁰ See "Temple," *EJ*.

¹¹ Edwin Goodenough, *By Light, Light: the Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1935), 8, 99.

¹² I. Mendelsohn, "Guilds in Ancient Palestine," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, 80 (1940), 17–21.

Jewish artisans were allowed to work on the Temple, and the esoteric symbolism of the architecture was considered so sacred that only priest-masons were allowed to work on the inner sanctuary. According to the Hellenistic-Jewish historian Flavius Josephus, over a thousand priests were thus trained as stonemasons and artificers.¹³ Even King Herod was not allowed into the construction work on the Holy of Holies: "he was forbidden, because he was not a priest." Moreover, only the highest ranking priest-masons could enter the Holy of Holies where the Cherubim guarded the Ark of the Covenant, and the artisans were concealed by specially-drawn curtains during their labors. The carefully guarded mystery of the Cherubim was their erotic nature, for the golden statuary represented a man and woman in sexual embrace.

The sexual mystery was similar to that of fertility rituals of Israel's pagan neighbors, and it was believed that the fertility of the people and earth depended upon the equilibrium of male and female potencies and the sacramental intercourse between the sexes. In fact, the copulating cherubim were the most important feature in the entire Temple: "It was due to them and due to their maker that the Temple stood."¹⁴ As long as Israel fulfilled the will of God, the faces of the Cherubim were turned toward each other; when Israel sinned, they turned their faces away from each other. During the Feast of Booths (or *Sukkoth*), which was a great fertility festival, the pilgrims were allowed to glimpse the statuary and then to indulge in "an orgiastic outburst of sexual license." Many rabbis and priests fought against the fertility rituals, in their determination to make Israel a purely monotheistic and anti-iconic religion, and they were humiliated when Antiochus, the Syrian king, sacked the Temple in 168 B.C. and paraded the statuary through the streets. A later rabbinic commentator lamented:

When the heathens entered the Temple and saw the Cherubim whose bodies were intertwined with one another, they carried them out and said: These Israelites, whose blessing is a blessing, and whose curse is a curse, occupy themselves with such things! And immediately they

¹³ "Temple," *EJ*; and Flavius Josephus, *The Life and Works of Flavius Josephus*, trans. William Whiston (1737; Philadelphia: J.C. Winston, 1957), 471-75.

¹⁴ See Patai, *Man and Temple*, 92, 103; and, *The Hebrew Goddess* (New York: Ktav, 1967), 26, 101-24.

despised them, as it is said: All that honoured her, despised her, because they have seen her nakedness.¹⁵

Of all the Jewish commentators on the Cherubim, only the Hellenistic Jews Philo and Josephus were reticent and even deceptive about their sexual nature. As Patai observes,

[It was] an embarrassment obviously created by the apprehension lest the pagan Greek readers for whom they wrote consider the Cherubim as but the Jewish equivalent of the statues of their own gods and goddesses and thus find a basis to refute and reject the claim that the Jews worshipped only one invisible God.¹⁶

Philo implied but refrained from stating explicitly that there was nothing in the Holy of Holies. Wolfson notes that he also shied away from the visionary implications of the etymology of the word "Israel" as "one who sees God."¹⁷ This was especially true for the visualization of God's presence as a conjoined male-female body. Going further, Josephus contradicted Biblical statements about the Cherubim and flatly stated that "there was nothing at all" in the chamber, which "was inaccessible and inviolable and not to be seen by any."¹⁸

In an important passage, Philo connected the creation of the world with a tradition of mystical architecture and sexuality:

... the Architect who made this universe was at the same time the father of what was thus born, whilst its mother was the Knowledge possessed by its Maker. With His knowledge God had union, not as men have it, and begot created things. And Knowledge, having received the divine seed, when her travail was consummated, bore the only beloved son who is apprehended by the senses, the world which we see.¹⁹

Patai stresses that the process of *creation* is represented in this passage in symbolic terms but, quite unequivocally, as *procreation*. Despite the efforts of Philo and Josephus, who wrote after the destruction of the Second Temple, to conceal the mystery, it survived in the mystical underground for centuries before erupting in the full blown sexual mythology of the Cabala in the thirteenth century.

¹⁵ Resh Lakish, early 4c. A.D.; in E. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols*, IV, 132.

¹⁶ R. Patai, *Hebrew Goddess*, 102.

¹⁷ Elliott Wolfson, *Through a Speculum that Shines: Vision and Imagination in Medieval Jewish Mysticism* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994), 50.

¹⁸ R. Patai, *Hebrew Goddess*, 11, 119.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 114.

We will return to the sexual mystery associated with the Jerusalem Temple when we examine the development of Gothic masonry. However, it will be useful now to examine the nature of the craft mystery of the working masonic guilds during the reconstruction of the Second Temple. Though Herod utilized the Jewish builders of Palestine, he relied especially on the Jewish artisan guilds of Alexandria, which were renowned for their skills. These Jewish masons, carpenters, and sculptors were also members of the General Union of Craftsmen in Alexandria, and they often collaborated with their pagan counterparts in various building enterprises. The Jews were officially forbidden to participate in the pagan mystery rites, but they were certainly aware of the elaborate and moving spectacles. For both pagan and Jewish stonemasons, the most relevant rites were those of the neo-Pythagorean fraternities, which played an important role in the intellectual and spiritual climate of Alexandria and Jerusalem. Given the central role of geometry in the planning and mechanics of the masons' craft, it seems certain that Jewish masonic guilds included Pythagorean geometry in their studies. Lieberman argues that Pythagorean symbolism had an important influence on the whole Temple cult.²⁰

During Hellenistic times, Pythagorean mathematics was deeply enmeshed with mystical doctrines, and the Greek sage was viewed as a veritable magician. Many contemporary writers, both pagan and Jewish, claimed that Pythagoras derived his magical knowledge from Jewish sources.²¹ In 160 B.C. the Jewish philosopher Aristobolus argued in Alexandria that all Greek philosophy derived from Moses and the prophets, that Pythagoras was a great Hebrew-educated *illuminatus*, and that contemporary "mystical mathematics" was part of a secret Jewish tradition.²² The subsequent legends that developed around the "Jewish Pythagoras" influenced accounts of the life of Moses written over a century later by Josephus and Philo. Josephus claimed that Moses was trained as a priest in the mysteries of Heliopolis in Egypt, which Philo described as instruction in mystical mathematics. Like the Pythagoreans, Philo believed that the

²⁰ Saul Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1956), 164–66.

²¹ George Sarton, *A History of Science* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1959), II, 245.

²² E. Goodenough, *By Light*, 277–82; Nikolaus Walter, *Der Thorausleger Aristobulus* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1964).

dynamics of the world structure depend on the interaction of contraries or pairs of opposites; however, he added the Jewish conception that odd and even numbers also represent male and female potencies.²³ In "Questions and Answers on Genesis," Philo discussed the sexual aspects of Creation in geometrical and numerical terms:

In the constitution of the universe, the (numerical) oddness of the masculine number composed of of unity produces squares [one manuscript reads "triangles"], but the feminine even number, composed of two produces oblong. Now the [male] square numbers are splendour and light, consisting of an equality of sides. But the [female] oblong numbers have night and darkness because of their inequality.²⁴

Philo expressed his admiration for "the most sacred sect of Pythagoreans," and it is possible that he was associated with a secret neo-Pythagorean school in Alexandria.²⁵ Some scholars suggest that he was initiated into the Temple cult, and it is significant that he gave the only original description of the Therapeutae, a Jewish fraternity that lived on the shores of Lake Mareotis outside Alexandria in the first century A.D. Conybeare argues that the term *Therapeutae* referred to a "religious guild" and that Greek readers of Philo would have viewed the fraternity as "a guild or collegia in the Alexandrian-Roman sense."²⁶ Provocatively, Conybeare then compares the guild of Therapeutae to the modern Freemasons. The Jewish guilds of Alexandria did indeed influence the development of the medieval European guilds, and it is possible that the Therapeutae and similar Jewish fraternities were an ancient source of Gothic theories of mystical architecture.

Like other Jewish guilds, the Therapeutae had their own living quarters and synagogue, where they developed in tightly protected secrecy their peculiar rites of spiritual illumination. The sect devoted itself to contemplation of the magical names of God and to mystical allegorization of the scripture, in which they utilized *Gematria* and Pythagorean number symbolism.²⁷ Though the Therapeutae disap-

²³ Ralph Marcus, *Philo: Supplement. Questions and Answers on Genesis and Exodus* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1928), I, 53, 59, etc.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 90.

²⁵ Philo Judaeus, *The Works of Philo Judaeus*, ed. C.D. Yonge (London: H.G. Bohn, 1855), III, 506.

²⁶ Frederick Conybeare, *Philo: About the Contemplative Life* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1895), 292–97.

²⁷ See Gershom Scholem, *On the Kabbalah and its Symbolism* (New York: Schocken Books, 1965), 45.

peared in the second century A.D., many eighteenth-century Freemasons believed them to be the precursors of Gothic masonic guilds.²⁸ Not enough is known about the Therapeutae to examine this claim further, but recent research on the related fraternity of Essenes and the Qumran community makes the Masonic conjecture plausible—if not proveable.

The Essenes were a Jewish brotherhood who appeared in Palestine in the second century B.C. Their name has been variously interpreted as the “pious ones,” the “healers,” the “silent ones,” or the “secret ones.”²⁹ The latter name is based on Mishnaic allusion to two rooms in the Temple of Jerusalem, the “chamber of utensils” and the “chamber of secrets.” Josephus claimed that while Herod was preoccupied with rebuilding the Jerusalem Temple, he favored the “Pythagorean” Essenes.³⁰ Conybeare argues that they were a religious guild, much like the Therapeutae.³¹ Thus, the revelation in the “Temple Scroll” that the Essenes expected an actual physical restoration of the Temple suggests their connection with the building guilds.³² The Essenes apparently broke away from the Jerusalem Temple when they lost control of the sacrificial system; subsequently, they developed a spritualization of the Temple cult which preserved the sexual mystery of the Cherubim.³³

The Essenes possessed the original Book of Enoch, which presented a complex and colorful visionary architecture. According to Idel, the Enochian text advocated the use of specific structures, together with incantations, which could “bring about the descent of celestial entities and their magical use.”³⁴ Like the ancient Temple rituals, the Enochian ritual of meditation could bring about the revelation of the *Shekinah* (the female element within God or His manifested presence) between the two Cherubim: “Their perfect state of union—even sexual union—is a function of performing the will of God” within the holy structure and performing the rituals of Judaism. Among the Essenes, who no longer had access to the physical Temple, the aim of each member was to become a Temple of the Holy Spirit

²⁸ A. Mackey, *Lexicon*, II, 783.

²⁹ “Essenes,” *Ej*.

³⁰ F. Josephus, *Life and Works*, 471–75.

³¹ F. Conybeare, *Philo*, 292–93.

³² See Shozo Fujita, *The Temple Theology of the Qumran Sect and the Book of Ezekiel* (Ph.D. Dissertation, Princeton University, 1970), 306.

³³ R. Patai, *Hebrew Goddess*, 122.

³⁴ Moshe Idel, *Kabbalah: New Perspectives* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1988), 167.

by passing through three grades of initiation—candidate, approacher, and associate.³⁵

At the first stage, the initiate received an apron as a symbol of purity. At the final stage, he took an oath of secrecy to preserve the magical mysteries. He swore by the number four, which was represented by ten dots in the form of a triangle. The parallels with later Masonic traditions of three degrees, lodge apron, secrecy oath, and recognition sign (triangle composed of three dots) are striking. At the summit of his initiatory training, the Jewish Essene became a spiritual Temple; he could also prophesy, perform miraculous cures, raise the dead, and “like Elias, be a forerunner of the Messiah.” These magical and messianic qualities shed some light on the peculiar necromantic and clairvoyant claims of seventeenth-century Scottish Masons and to later Scottish beliefs that Freemasonry developed out of the Essenean guilds.³⁶

Several scholars trace the influence of the architectural mysticism of the Therapeutae and Essenes on various passages in the Christian Gospels. They also stress that Jesus and most of his followers were heterodox Jews, who were probably influenced by these or similar communities. Isenberg notes the hostility between Jesus and the Jerusalem Temple cult and his rejection of sacrifices as a redemptive medium.³⁷ The apostle Paul also rejected the physical Temple as a means of regeneration. Gärtner traces the parallels between the masonic imagery of Paul’s teaching and the Essene texts, noting that Paul likened himself to “a skilled master-builder” who “laid the foundations of this spiritual edifice.”³⁸ Even more intriguing are Morton Smith’s studies on the secret Gospel of Mark, which leads him to argue that Jesus himself was an initiate of an esoteric order and that many of his followers viewed him as a magician and hierophant of the sexual mysteries within the regenerated Temple.³⁹ Moreover,

³⁵ Christian Ginzburg, *The Essenes and the Kabbalah* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955), 2–17.

³⁶ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 142–44, 161; Alexander Lawrie, *History of Freemasonry* (Edinburgh: Alexander Lawrie, 1804), 38.

³⁷ Sheldon Isenberg, “Power Through Temple and Torah in Greco-Roman Palestine,” in Jacob Neusner, ed., *Christianity, Judaism, and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith* (London: E.J. Brill, 1975), 24–52, 45.

³⁸ Bertil Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1965), 49, 57, 64.

³⁹ Morton Smith, *Clement of Alexandria and the Secret Gospel of Mark* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1973); and *Jesus the Magician* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1978).

it should be remembered that Jesus and Paul were trained craftsmen—a carpenter and tentmaker, respectively—and may have been guild members themselves.

The work of the Jewish building guilds and the priest-masons on the renovation of the Herodian Temple continued until its destruction by the Roman emperor Titus in 70 A.D. According to a later Italian tradition, Titus then utilized thirty thousand Jewish captives to cut the Travertine stone and finish the construction of the Colosseum in Rome. Through John Evelyn, this tradition of Jewish masons in Rome would influence seventeenth-century British Freemasonry.⁴⁰ Despite the flight of many Jewish craftsmen to Alexandria and Babylonia, there were still functioning guilds in Erez Israel after the calamity. There was even a short-lived attempt to rebuild the Temple in 130 A.D., but after the Roman suppression of the Second Jewish Revolt in 135 A.D., Jewish Temple-building came to an end (except for an abortive effort in the fourth-century A.D.). Many of the customs and rituals were subsequently transferred to the synagogue, though some were forbidden because they were too intimately connected with the Temple cult.⁴¹ The traditions of spiritualizing the Temple, which were once the secret teachings of Jewish sectarians, became of necessity a central Jewish tradition. While the system of sacrifices became internalized in the prayers of the liturgy, the masons and artisans of the synagogues found new ways to utilize the mystical symbolism of the Temple.

Many of the priest-masons from Jerusalem joined pagan guilds in Alexandria and Roman collegia in the Empire, where they continued to guard their own guild secrets and traditions. With the recovery of Palestinian Jewry in the late second century, there was an increased demand for synagogues and a revival of the building trades. One surviving example, the synagogue at Dura Europa in Syria (third century A.D.), reveals that the Jewish architects were still intensely preoccupied with Temple mysticism and felt free to portray on painted wall panels the stages of initiation into the cult.⁴² Patai argues that the painting of a nude woman holding an infant

⁴⁰ P. Totti, *Ritratto de Roman antica* (1627); conflated from the 1638 edition in *The Diary of John Evelyn*, ed. E.S. De Beer (Oxford: Clarendon, 1955), II, 249.

⁴¹ "Crafts" and "Synagogue," *EJ*; E. Goodenough, *Symbols*, IV, 67.

⁴² "Dura-Europa," *EJ*; Goodenough, *Symbols*, I, 253; IX, 46, and *By Light*, 260–62; Joseph Guttmann, ed., *The Synagogue: Studies in Origins, Archaeology, and Architecture* (New York: Ktav, 1975), 111.

in a river represents the *Shekinah* and Moses—a daring hint at the sexual myth of the Tabernacle and Temple.⁴³ Curiously, the floor mosaics at Dura, which were lost until the mid-nineteenth century, bear striking resemblance to seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Masonic floor and tracing-board designs.⁴⁴ Further excavations of synagogues in Italy, Turkey, and Yugoslavia reveal that, despite official prohibitions, Jewish stone cutters and artisans continued to create astrological and magical symbols—especially the hexagram (Shield of David), pentagram (Seal of Solomon), and the Heracleian square-knot (magical square).

Throughout this period, from the second through fourth centuries, Christian writers condemned symbolic art and architecture as linked with Jewish magic. Clement of Alexandria condemned artists for breaking the eighth commandment—“thou shalt not steal”—because the artist “seeks to usurp the Divine prerogative of creation” by means of graphic art.⁴⁵ Christian writers gleefully recounted the “miracles” which prevented the effort of Julian the Apostate to collect a great Jewish working force to rebuild the Jerusalem Temple (ca. 362). Neusner notes that the tradition, minus the miracles, was probably true and that the Persian government refused to allow the economically valuable Jewish stonemasons to emigrate to Jerusalem.⁴⁶ The renewed messianic yearnings and hopes for the restoration of the Temple intensified the Temple-mysticism of the synagogues, as well as the hardening of Christian opposition.

However, when Christian art began to develop in the fifth century, it was heavily indebted to Jewish traditions. At the unusual dedication of an early church at Tyre, Eusebius expressed his awe at the Christian builder, whom he portrayed as a new Bezalel, Solomon, and Zerubabel:

[The builder] in no wise doth fall behind that Bezalel, whom God himself filled with the spirit of wisdom and understanding and with the knowledge as well of crafts and sciences, and called him to be the workman that constructs the temple of heavenly types in symbolic fashion.⁴⁷

⁴³ R. Patai, *Hebrew Goddess*, 96, 275–91.

⁴⁴ See Solomon Zeitlin, “The Origin of the Synagogue” in J. Guttman, *Synagogue*, plate facing 97.

⁴⁵ Joseph Guttman, ed., *The Temple of Solomon: Archaeological Fact and Medieval Tradition in Christian, Islamic, and Jewish Art* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976), xvi–xvii.

⁴⁶ Jacob Neusner, *A History of the Jews in Babylonia* (Leiden: Brill, 1966), IV, 33–34.

⁴⁷ J. Guttman, *Temple*, xxiii.

Kretchmar suggests that "pattern books" as well as oral instruction were probably involved in the transmission of Jewish architectural symbolism to Christian designers.⁴⁸ Moreover, during the emerging period of ubiquitous heresies among all the religions of the crumbling Roman empire, there was much cross-fertilization between mystics and artisans from sect to sect and guild to guild.

The profusion of Pythagorean and Philonic geometrical symbolism in the scattered synagogues was influenced by the secret teachings of contemporary theosophical schools, which existed throughout the Jewish diaspora until the tenth century A.D. In these clandestine cells of *Merkabah* mysticism, a complex tradition of visionary architecture was developed, in which the initiate meditated upon Ezekiel's vision of the divine chariot (the *Merkabah*) which carried him to the celestial throne world. In the process, he travelled through the spheres and perceived the spectacular beauty of the seven celestial palaces (the *Hekhalot*).

In his important study of Jewish visualization techniques, Wolfson asks:

Did the Merkavah mystics actually ascend to the celestial realm and did they see something "out there," or should these visions be read as psychological accounts of what may be considered in Freudian language a type of self-hypnosis? . . .

Some texts assume a bodily ascent, a translation into the heavenly realm of the whole person, whereas others assume an ascent of the soul or mind separated from the body as the result of a paranormal experience such as a trance-induced state.⁴⁹

What is relevant to architecture and masonry is that these techniques enabled the adept to "see" previously invisible mathematical-linguistic concepts in the forms of chariots, thrones, palaces and, ultimately, the Temple.

Much of the mythology of the *Merkabah* teachings centered on the fluctuating fortunes of the Second Jerusalem Temple, and it formed a peculiar extra-Biblical esoteric tradition of architectural symbolism. The influence of *Merkabah* symbolism on the designs at Dura Europa suggests that the role of priest-architect and priest-mason continued

⁴⁸ See Joseph Guttman, *No Graven Images: Studies in Art and the Hebrew Bible* (New York: Ktav, 1971), xxxviii.

⁴⁹ E. Wolfson, *Speculum*, 109.

within the building guilds, but as an increasingly secret instruction.⁵⁰ Both the *Merkabah* and *Hekhalot* traditions were associated with actual building practices and were evidently taught in the building guilds. These masonic and architectural motifs provide a clue to the symbolism of third- and fourth-century synagogues—the prototypes of the first Christian churches—and to the contemporary “mystery of the craft.”

The generic term of *Ma'aseh Merkabah* can be translated as “the labor of the Vision” or “the mechanics of the Vision.”⁵¹ In order to ride in the chariot through the celestial spheres, the initiate had to master mechanical techniques of meditation, which included concentration on the Hebrew scriptures and *Gematria*, as well as breath-control, chanted hymns, and certain body movements. This control of his own creative forces, by which he could master the elements of the earthly and angelic worlds, reflected the powers of the highest angel, Anaphiel, who guarded the sixth gate and shielded the visionary from the intensity of the Divine Presence, which shone forth in the inaccessible seventh palace. Anaphiel functioned like Philo's Divine Architect or the Gnostic demi-urge; he was the creator, artificer, and shaper of the perceivable universe.

The “mechanics of the Vision” produced a series of graduated visionary experiences which possibly provide a key to the program of Dura-style paintings and designs. The master revealed that “to know the secret of the *Merkabah*” is like “having a ladder in one's house and being able to go up and down at will.” The steps of the ladder consist of various ascetic disciplines and meditation techniques that elevate the initiate into different levels of visionary trance. Interestingly, the Essenes possessed *Merkabah* treatises, and it is possible that the techniques of climbing the ladder were similar to those of rebuilding the inner temple. The symbolic rituals of ladder-climbing and temple-building that emerged in eighteenth-century *Écossais* Freemasonry may be survivals of these early Jewish visionary techniques. It is also significant that *Merkabah* was a form of group mysticism, in which the brothers helped each other through the graduated stages of illumination.

⁵⁰ “Dura Europa,” *EJ*; E. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols*, I, 253; IX, 46; J. Neusner, *History* II, 77–79, 194–201.

⁵¹ The following discussion draws on David Blumenthal, *Understanding Jewish Mysticism: The Merkabah Tradition and the Zoharic Tradition* (New York: Ktav, 1978); and Ithmar Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (Leiden: Brill, 1980).

In the *Merkabah* schools, the role of the divinely inspired architect took on increasingly magical connotations. It was now claimed that Bezalel, the archetypal master mason, knew the secrets of creation and the magical names and numbers of God: "Bezalel knew how to combine the letters by which heavens and earth were created."⁵² Bezalel could body forth the body of God; in fact he and his *Merkabah* brothers could see and manipulate the "measure of the body" of God (called the *Shi'ur Komah*). By duplicating Bezalel's magical *Gematria*, the adept could ascend through the celestial architecture of gates and palaces. In order to pass by the hostile planet-angels who guard each gate, the initiate had to display his "seals," amulets composed of complicated geometric designs which embodied magical power. Scholem notes that these geometric figures strangely resemble the mental images called *yantras* which were used in Yogic meditation techniques, and they probably reflected the cross-fertilization of Jewish and Asian meditation techniques.⁵³

Having mastered the difficult passage through the gates and palaces, the adept finally stood before God's supernal throne. There, he was granted a vision of God in quasi-bodily form, which was daringly identified with the "figure in the form of a man" whom Ezekiel had seen on the throne (*Ezekiel* I: 26). The adepts went further to suggest that the figure was the primordial man, the microcosmic image of God the Creator. In the boldest of meditative moves, the adept could even envision and manipulate a bizarre system of numerologies and measurements of the divine presence. In the *Shi'ur Komah* fragments, enormous figures are given for the length of each organ of the "body of God." As Scholem observes, what is really meant by these monstrous measurements is not made clear:

The units of measurement are cosmic; the height of the Creator is 236,000 parasangs . . . the height of His soles alone is 30 million parasangs. But "the measure of a parasang of God is three miles, and a mile has 10,000 yards, and a yard three spans of His span, and a span fills the whole world, as it is written, "Who hath meted out heaven with the span" . . . Whether the proportion of the various figures, now hopelessly confused in the texts, once expressed some intrinsic relationships and harmonies is a question to which we are not likely to find an answer. But a feeling for the transmundane and

⁵² J. Neusner, *History*, II, 155.

⁵³ Gershom Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1960), 33.

the numinous still glimmers through these blasphemous-sounding figures and monstrous groupings of secret names. God's holy majesty takes on flesh and blood, as it were, in these enormous numerical relationships.⁵⁴

Over the next centuries, the *Merkabah* texts began to vaguely identify the microcosmic man with the microcosmic Throne and Temple. Lesser notes that in Gothic design, "the church building signifies nothing less than the body of the Lord," which is "summarized and condensed in the sacred geometry."⁵⁵ Superimposed on this architectural "body of God" is the symbolism of Throne and Temple of Solomon. It is perhaps one of the stranger ironies of history that this originally Jewish yearning for transmundane and numinous mathematics would find its greatest architectural expression in the towering Gothic cathedrals built by Christian stonemasons.

The mystical numerologies and geometry of the *Merkabah* scrolls reached their peak in the *Sepher Yetzirah* or "Book of Formation," which is replete with vivid architectural and masonic imagery. A brief collection of magical treatises, mainly composed in the second or third century A.D., the *Sepher Yetzirah* embodies the secret teachings on the *Ma'aseh Bereshit*, or the labor and the mechanics of creation. God's role as an artisan—hewing, shaping, and forming—is stressed, and the image of man that mirrors God is man's creative power of craftsmanship. The tools used to create the universe are the ten *sephirot*, or first ten numbers of the decimal system, and the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet. Together these form the thirty-two secret paths of wisdom. Each *sephirot* constitutes a realm within which the Creator carries out a specific creative activity. The adept's knowledge of the *sephirot*, a term which probably originates from Persian land measurements, parallels the knowledge of the "measure of the body" in the *Shi'ur Komah* material. But in the *Sepher Yetzirah*, the emphasis is on building the supernal Temple through mathematical-linguistic-magical manipulations.

In Chapter One, which purports to be an explication of the Creation story in *Genesis*, God creates the universe by engraving the letters of his Name and by bounding it with mathematical dimen-

⁵⁴ Gershom Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, rev. ed. (1941; New York: Schocken, 1954), 64.

⁵⁵ George Lesser, *Gothic Cathedrals and Sacred Geometry* (London: Alec Tiranti, 1957), 148–50.

sions. The creative *sephirot* form a circle, the perfect geometric form. In Chapter Five, a complicated geometric image is formed by a man “who is inside a cube which, in turn, is inside a sphere,” with the lines of intersection shifting and growing to infinity. The Divine Artisan simultaneously carves out the magical letters in order to construct the “edifice” of the universe. Idel observes that the mystical language has a “masonic” function, for the letters and words serve as building blocks:

Letters are regarded as stones, as full-fledged entities, as components intended to build up an edifice of words to serve as a temple for God and a place of encountering Him for the mystic. After the Temple was destroyed . . . man is supposed to rebuild the Temple in his ritual usage of language . . . The “masonic” aspects of the divine and human activity reveal a hidden and mighty dimension of the Hebrew letters . . . [which enable] operations that can bridge the gap between the human- or the material—and the divine.⁵⁶

Thus, in the *Sepher Yetzirah*, the adept undertakes a “masonic” process of letter-combination, meditation, and visualization:

Twenty-two letters are the Foundation: He engraved them, He hewed them out, He combined them, He weighed them, and He set them at opposites, and He formed through them everything that is formed and everything that is destined to be formed.⁵⁷

From the foundation stone, He engraved out “a kind of furrow,” and “He raised it like a kind of wall. He surrounded it like a kind of ceiling.” He then “hewed out great columns from Air which is not tangible.” Finally, the “Holy Temple is set in the middle and supports them all.” The “mechanics of creation” culminate in the completion of the microcosmic Temple.

The great significance of the *Sepher Yetzirah* to both Jewish and Gothic masonic traditions lies in this interpretation of meditation techniques in terms of masonic imagery. Kaplan notes that “the Hebrew letters can be used as a powerful means of drawing down spiritual energy,” especially through the technique of “holding an image in the mind’s eye”:

⁵⁶ Moshe Idel, “The Reification of Language,” in Steven T. Katz, ed., *Mysticism and Language* (New York: Oxford UP, 1992), 43.

⁵⁷ D. Blumenthal, *Understanding*, 21–26.

... the *Sefer Yetzirah* refers to two processes in depicting the letters, “engraving” (*chakikah*) and “hewing” (*chatzivah*)

... The term “engraving” denotes fixing an image in the mind’s eye so that it does not waver or move... when the image is clear and steady—“engraved” in the mind, as it were—it is usually surrounded by other images. The next step is to isolate it and rid the mind’s eye of all other imagery. This is known as “hewing” or *chatzivah*. The analogy is to hewing out a stone from the surrounding rock. The process consists in designating the desired stone and then hewing away all extraneous imagery surrounding the desired form.⁵⁸

For the Jewish meditator, intense concentration on the numerical and linguistic permutations involved in the “mechanics of creation” is accompanied by rhythmic breathing, chanting, and possibly geometric *yantras*, so that the interior psychic “building” process leads the initiate into a state of visionary trance. Thus, the adept ponders upon and chants these “masonic” lines:

Two stones build two houses,
Three stones build six houses,
Four stones build twenty-four houses,
Six stones build one hundred and twenty houses,
Seven stones build five thousand and forty houses.

From here on go out and think what the mouth is unable to speak, and the ear is unable to hear.⁵⁹

Each stone represents a process of *Gematria* which stimulates abstruse intellectual calculations.

Idel observes that this technique did not produce a calmness or stillness—the *desideratum* of non-Jewish mystical practices—but a “hyper-activation of the mind” and a “high excitation of the mental processes.”⁶⁰ This uniquely intellectual component of Jewish visionary rituals would later make an important contribution to the development of early-modern mathematics and science. Blumenthal’s startling computer analysis of the masonic *Gematria* process of meditation—based on the incantation, “He put them in order like a kind of wall”—reveals that the letters and their numerical equivalents actually form a pictorial wall when printed out from the computer.⁶¹

⁵⁸ Aryeh Kaplan, *Jewish Meditation: A Practical Guide* (New York: Schocken, 1985), 78–79.

⁵⁹ D. Blumenthal, *Understanding*, 37.

⁶⁰ M. Idel, *Kabbalah*, 97.

⁶¹ D. Blumenthal, *Understanding*, 27.

Similarly, the computer prints out the *Gematria* of “He made them like a kind of sunset” as a picture of a radiating sunset. This capacity to visualize the architectural and pictorial expression of complex mathematical and geometrical speculation would later appear in the Gothic master-masons’ designs for the great “transmundane and numinous” cathedrals.

Wolfson notes that “there is an inherent danger in this process of visualization, especially if it is communicated in a public forum.”⁶² Thus, the adept was repeatedly admonished to keep silent and to not get carried away with his visionary feats. The dangerous power involved in these practices spilled over into other activities. According to the *Sepher Yetzirah*, the visualization techniques that accompanied the practice of *Gematria* provided a key to all the sciences. Thus, the clandestine Jewish masonic science was also linked to clandestine chemical science. In the early fourth century, Zozimos—a Greek alchemist in Alexandria—wrote that the Jews deceitfully acquired the secrets of the “sacred craft” and the knowledge of the “power of gold” from the Egyptians and that they subsequently imparted al-chemical knowledge to the rest of the world.⁶³ Zozimos stressed that “the true teachings about the Great Art” were to be found only in the “writings and books of the Jews.” Jewish alchemy thrived in the guilds of silver- and gold-smiths in Alexandria, and there is evidence of genuine chemical expertise in surviving treatises.

This early connection of alchemy with Jewish guild traditions may provide a clue to the later emergence of alchemy as an alleged art of Freemasonry, for Zozimos described Bezalel, the archetypal master-builder, as a great alchemist. Just as Bezalel’s skill at combining the letters was credited by the *Merkabah* mystics with providing his architectural power, so his masonic *Gematria* was credited by the alchemists with creating the golden glories of the Tabernacle. Zozimos’s description of “Maria the Jewess,” who gained fame as an alchemist, is provocative, for her esoteric sayings oddly parallel the masonic mathematics of the *Sepher Yetzirah*.⁶⁴

⁶² E. Wolfson, *Speculum*, 73.

⁶³ “Alchemy,” *EJ*; Moshe Idel, “The Origin of Alchemy According to Zozimos and a Hebrew Parallel,” *Revue des Études Juives*, 145 (1986), 117–24.

⁶⁴ Raphael Patai, “Maria the Jewess—Founding Mother of Alchemy,” *Ambix*, 29 (1982), 171–93.

During the fifth through seventh centuries, Jewish science, crafts, and magic flourished in the Middle East and gradually began to influence related developments in Western Europe. In *The Christian Topography* (ca. 548), the widely travelled Christian merchant Cosmas Indicopleustes—a native of Alexandria—praised the God-given architectural skills of the Jews who built the Tabernacle; moreover, “up to this very day most of these arts are most zealously cultivated among the Jews.”⁶⁵ Curiously, Pines suggests that Cosmas shared the doctrines of cosmic architecture advanced in the *Sepher Yetzirah* and other Jewish works.⁶⁶ Another Christian writer described admiringly the flourishing crafts of the Jews in Alexandria, especially in stonemasonry, woodcarving, and metalworking.⁶⁷ The sixth-century *Mishnat Ha-Middot*, or “Study of the Measurements,” the earliest known mathematical work in Hebrew, was probably produced within the building guilds by *Merkabah*-trained artisans. The fragment is a study of geometric shapes, and it is evidently part of a work on the construction and measurements of the Tabernacle and the arrangements and dimensions of the Temple.⁶⁸

During these years, Jewish artisans and rabbis carried the *Merkabah* teachings into the Byzantine areas of Italy, where a spate of Judaizing heresies emerged among the populace and engendered great concern among the Church Fathers. This increased Christian-Jewish cross-fertilization had a direct impact on artistic and architectural developments. Sukenik stresses that “the early church, whose Gospel was preached in Jewish synagogues and professed by men of Jewish race, took over the art of the synagogue with its ritual.”⁶⁹ The symbolic mosaics of the fifth-century Santa Maria Maggiore in Ravenna were based on an “originally Jewish tradition of symbolism.”⁷⁰ In

⁶⁵ J.W. McCrindle, ed., *The Christian Topography of Cosmas, an Egyptian Monk*. Hakluyt Society, #98 (1897; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1964), 122–23; Salo Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, 2nd rev. ed. (New York: Columbia UP, 1966), IV, 167.

⁶⁶ Shlomo Pines, *Studies in the History of Jewish Thought*, eds. Warren Harvey and Moshe Idel (Jerusalem: Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1997), 136–39.

⁶⁷ Franz Landsberger, *A History of Jewish Art* (Cincinnati: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1946), 190.

⁶⁸ George Sarton, *Introduction to the History of Science* (Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins, 1947), I, 208.

⁶⁹ E.L. Sukenik, *Ancient Synagogues in Palestine and Greece* (London: Oxford UP, 1934), 67.

⁷⁰ Erwin Goodenough, “Early Christian and Jewish Art,” in J. Guttman, *No Graven*, 409–16.

the contemporary church of Santa Sabina in Rome, two huge female figures were carved to represent the church and the synagogue; unlike their Gothic descendants, the two figures were portrayed with equal sympathy and dignity.⁷¹ Nordstrom contends that the Jewish traditions of symbolic art and architecture were “probably preserved from late antiquity, although the intermediate links have vanished.”⁷²

However, increasing evidence of the continuing vitality of Jewish building guilds suggests that the guilds were instrumental in transmitting the symbolic and mystical traditions of the synagogue and Temple to the Christian West. In fact, Wischnitzer argues that Jewish handicraftsmen brought “the idea of the guild” from the Near East and that Jewish guilds played a vital role in the transmission of crafts within the Byzantine Empire.⁷³ In the late sixth century in Byzantine Sicily, a Jewish prophet and mystic named Elijah stimulated a Judaizing movement that gained many converts from Christianity, thus driving an alarmed Pope Gregory I to severely suppress the movement.⁷⁴ It is probable that Jewish masons and artisans, and their Christian sympathizers, then migrated north, bringing their guild traditions with them.

Soon after the persecution of the Judaized heretics, a new “Fraternity of Comacine Builders” was formed by wandering stonemasons who settled on Lake Como. Como was a free republic which provided a refuge for many independent or restless spirits, including—allegedly—the fugitive stonemasons who formed a secret society of master-builders.⁷⁵ Staley observes that although the origin of the Comacine guild is “lost in antiquity,” it was probably a “survival of ancient Jewish and Egyptian times.”⁷⁶ The Comacine builders initially continued Roman building traditions; then, under the influence of the Byzantine craftsmen who entered the guild, they gradually “orientalized” their style. At the same time, Jewish mystics brought the esoteric traditions of the *Merkabah* and *Sepher Yetzirah* to Lombardy,

⁷¹ Israel Abrahams, “The Decalogue in Art,” in J. Guttman, *No Graven*, 48.

⁷² Carl-Otto Nordstrom, “The Temple Miniatures in the Peter Comestos Manuscripts at Madrid,” in J. Guttman, *No Graven*, 40.

⁷³ M. Wischnitzer, *History*, 67, 74.

⁷⁴ Louis Newman, *Jewish Influence on Christian Reform Movements* (1925; rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1966), 410.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 240; A. Mackey, *Lexicon*, 161–66.

⁷⁶ Edgumbe Staley, *The Guilds of Florence* (1906; rpt. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1967), 321–23.

while Jewish guildsmen introduced the silk industry and other crafts in Lucca.⁷⁷ One result was a prolonged wave of Judaizing heresies throughout the region.

Provocatively, the Comacine masonic guildsmen seemed to draw upon Jewish esoteric traditions of Temple mysticism. Their motto, "Our Temple was made without hands," echoed the distinction that the Alexandrian mystics made between the Lower Mystery of the "Temple made with hands" and the Higher Mystery of the spiritualized "Temple of the *Sophia*."⁷⁸ Moreover, their permanent guild home was called the "stationary Temple," while the groups of travelling stonemasons were called the "ambulatory lodge."⁷⁹ Many Masonic historians speculate that the influence of Byzantine building "corporations," such as that at Como, on northern Teutonic guilds eventually produced Gothic "free masonry."⁸⁰ When the Gothic stoneworkers gathered in their "lodge" (a specially-designed hut on the cathedral building site), they called the structure a "tabernaculum."

Other historians of the masonic craft argue that Gothic architecture was "Saracenic" in origin—a view held by Christopher Wren, the seventeenth-century architect and Freemason.⁸¹ Both schools of thought are partially accurate, though the proponents were not aware that a significant medium between Byzantine and Arabic influences on Gothic masonry was provided by the Jewish guilds. In 622, when Muhammad emigrated to Medina, he made contact with Merkabah mystics, whose visionary techniques and legends were assimilated into Muslim theosophy.⁸² Initially expecting his prophetic claims to be accepted by the Jews, Muhammad included allusions to the spiritualized Temple of Jerusalem in his writings. Though he was disappointed by the "stubbornness" of the Jews and eventually persecuted them, his successors continued to honor the Jewish prophets as forebears of Muhammad. From the time of the Moslem conquest of Jerusalem in 638 to the subsequent invasions of Spain in 711 and

⁷⁷ G. Scholem, *Kabbalah*, 33; M. Wischnitzer, *History*, 78; L. Newman, *Jewish Influence*, 241).

⁷⁸ E. Goodenough, *By Light*, 270–76.

⁷⁹ E. Staley, *Guilds*, 321–23.

⁸⁰ Robert Freke Gould, *History and Antiquities of Freemasonry*, 3rd rev. ed. (1882–87; New York: Yorsten, 1951), I, 45; Joseph Fort Newton, *The Builders: A Story and Study of Masonry* (1914; rpt. New York: Doran, 1924), 377–78.

⁸¹ Christopher Wren, *Parentalia* (London, 1750), 211, 306–07.

⁸² Dan Merkur, *Gnosis: An Esoteric Tradition of Mystical Visions and Unions* (Albany: State University of New York, 1993), 195–97.

Sicily in 878, the fortunes of Jewish mystics and craftsmen improved dramatically in the more tolerant atmosphere of the Islamic territories.⁸³

The Arabs undertook ambitious building projects in the East, and Jewish builders took an active part in the new construction. In 691 in Jerusalem, the great mosque of the Dome of the Rock was built on the site of the Herodian Temple, which was widely believed to stand on the foundations of the Solomonic Temple. The Arabs assimilated the magical traditions of Solomon and Hiram Abif into their own architectural lore. In the mid-700's, when the Caliph Al-Mansur planned the new city of Baghdad, he called upon the geometric expertise of the Jewish architect Mash'alla to draw up the designs.⁸⁴ These geometrical configurations were later revered among Moslem mystics for their magical significance.⁸⁵ The Caliph utilized the guilds of Jewish builders in both the higher architectural and lower artisan branches of construction work. Jews also worked on the managerial and labor side of the numerous stone quarries of the East, and they allegedly dominated the extensive building trades of the Arab dominions.

Throughout the Islamic world, there was much guild-mixing between Arabs and Jews, and the Moslem artisans seemed to draw upon the mystery traditions of the Jewish guilds. The Sufi mystics of Islam assimilated *Merkabah* meditation techniques and Solomonic Temple mysticism into their own fraternities. The earliest surviving description of Moslem guilds is found in the fifty-two treatises of the *Ikhwah al-Safa*, or "Brethren of Sincerity," composed circa 961-86 in Basra, near Baghdad. The Brethren functioned as an esoteric religious fraternity of craftsmen, and their epistles reveal the three grades of initiation by which the brother gains insight into spiritual arcana.⁸⁶ In their "gnostic encyclopedia," the mathematical and natural sciences are identified with the occult arts, which can aid the initiate in understanding the hidden meaning of Moslem texts and rituals.⁸⁷ Though the Brethren of Sincerity drew upon the syncretistic magical lore of Hermetic, Pythagorean, neo-Platonic, Indian, and Persian traditions,

⁸³ See A.H. and H.E. Cutler, *The Jew as Ally of the Muslim* (Notre Dame: Notre Dame UP, 1986).

⁸⁴ S. Baron, *History*, VIII, 148.

⁸⁵ Idries Shah, *The Sufis* (London: W.H. Allen, 1964), 220.

⁸⁶ G. Sarton, *Introduction*, II, 154; Y. Marquet, "Ikhwan al-Safa," *Encyclopedia of Islam*, rev. ed. (London: Luzac, 1971), 1071-76.

⁸⁷ F.E. Peters, *Aristotle and the Arabs* (New York: New York UP, 1968), 113.

they attributed the origin of all esoteric wisdom to ancient Hebrew tradition. Echoing Aristobolus and Philo, they traced Greek philosophy to its Jewish roots.⁸⁸

Like the Jewish students of the *Sepher Yetzirah* and the *Merkabah* schools, the Sufi initiates stressed the occult relations of numbers, letters, and geometric configurations in sacramental building processes (both material and psychological). As Shah points out, Hebrew and Arabic use similar numerical equivalents for the Semitic letters, and Sufi mathematicians used *Gematria* to make identical the words for architect, geometer, and point or dot (*muhandis*)—a magical process which revealed the secrets of the Prime Builder.⁸⁹ This esoteric architectural terminology was taught through a dialogue or catechism between the Sufi master and his apprentice, while the initiatory relationship was patterned upon that of the craft guilds. Trimingham observes that,

As the latter had a grandmaster and a hierarchy of apprentices, companions, and master-craftsmen, so the religious orders acquired a hierarchy of novices, initiates, and masters. Since legal Islam tolerated the secret character of the initiation and oath of the guilds, it had to accept the implications of the act of allegiance to the *shaik-at-tariqa* [master of the guild] when Shi'i practice was maintained.⁹⁰

Shah sees the origin of Gothic and modern Freemasonry in these Sufi fraternities and, though his argument seems overly-simplistic, the development of the Moslem mystical guilds certainly bears striking similarities to those of later Christian Freemasons. Sarton's more cautious summary of the Moslem guilds can almost be read as a capsule definition of the later Masonic orders:

They are always real fraternities . . . they have strong mystical tendencies; they attach great importance to their peculiar traditions and rites, which may be strange, complicated, moving, beautiful. They manage to combine the most mulish obscurantism in certain matters with liberalism in others, or rather with receptiveness to erratic ideas, unpopular outside the *tariqa* [guild] . . . they often obtained considerable popularity, influence, and power. Their power might become political, even military . . .⁹¹

⁸⁸ G. Sarton, *History*, II, 246; Y. Marquet, "Ikhwah," 1074.

⁸⁹ I. Shah, *Sufis*, 173, 372.

⁹⁰ J.S. Trimingham, *The Sufi Orders in Islam* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971), 25.

⁹¹ G. Sarton, *Introduction*, II, 421.

From the ninth through twelfth centuries, the esoteric traditions of both Jewish and Moslem mystical fraternities gradually penetrated Christian Europe in a mixed Judeo-Arabic form. At a popular level, the *Merkabah* and *Sepher Yetzirah* teachings had spread throughout the Jewish communities of Italy and southern France by the late ninth century, especially through the agency of a Jewish wonder-worker who emigrated from Baghdad.⁹² However, the most important intellectual agent of the Jewish mystical traditions was the Arabic writing of the Jewish scholar Saadya Gaon (888–942). This brilliant polymath played a seminal role in the translation of Greek and Arabic works into Latin, thus bringing new Jewish light into the Christian “dark ages.” While studying in Egypt, Saadya was deeply influenced by the Sufi “Brethren of Sincerity,” and he strove to reconcile Jewish and Moslem mystical theories into a monistic, rationalistic Judaism.⁹³

Though he criticized the sephirotic theory of emanation in the *Sepher Yetzirah*, Saadya was fascinated by its mystical mathematics, which he believed to be a rationalist method of gaining occult knowledge. He argued that much of our knowledge of the secrets of nature “is demonstrated only by the means of the science of geometry”; thus, “we must first master the science of plane geometry.”⁹⁴ Though such study was frowned upon by many rabbinic authorities, Saadya defended geometry and denied that such “speculation leads to unbelief and is conducive to heresy.” Nevertheless, geometrical and mathematical studies—especially those involving Pythagoreanism—were increasingly attacked by the authorities as forbidden magical arts. For Saadya, and for succeeding Jewish mathematicians influenced by his works, there was no contradiction between mathematical logic and visionary theosophy. Thus, he drew upon Arabic and Greek lore to write learned treatises on triangulation and methods of “halving the square,” while at the same time utilizing mystical *Gematria*.

Commenting on the *Sepher Yetzirah*, he described the mysteries of creation in geometric and masonic terms, for God “created things ex nihilo, and what is from what is not, and quarried great pillars

⁹² G. Scholem, *Kabbalah*, 33.

⁹³ S. Baron, *History*, VIII, 25; Israel Efros, *Studies in Medieval Jewish Philosophy* (New York: Columbia UP, 1974), 46.

⁹⁴ Samuel Rosenblatt, *Saadia Gaon: the Book of Belief and Opinions* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1948), 23–27.

from impalpable air." After the masonic labor of quarrying, God pursued the architect's task of drawing and designing:

Thus when he drew in the air straight lines in circles, triangles, and squares, and also traced oblique lines in circles, triangles, and squares, there came into being, out of the bending and crossing of one line over and over, plane and solid figures.⁹⁵

Like Philo and the *Merkabah* mystics, Saadya viewed this masonic-geometric process as the basis of divine architecture.

Thus, he argued that the structure of the Jerusalem Temple at the time of redemption will be according to the idealized Solomonic vision, as described by Ezekiel.⁹⁶ Goodenough observes that "in this pre-Kabbalistic mystic" there suddenly emerged the "forgotten allegory of the Temple as the symbol of the Cosmos"; he then concludes that "the Mystery was never entirely forgotten among Jews" and that it had "a consecutive, if now lost, history."⁹⁷ As we have seen, a major agent of this consecutive history was probably the Jewish-Arabic building guild. Saadya's merging of mathematics and mysticism into a form of "rationalistic transcendentalism" became an important influence on the development of the medieval mathematical tradition that shaped the Gothic masonic guild and its geometric-architectural "mystery." The infusion of these Jewish-Sufic trends into Christian Europe began during Saadya's lifetime.

In southern Italy, the Jewish physician Shabbetai Donnolo (913–984) was stirred by the reviving interest in *Merkabah* mysticism and the increasing local influence of Sufism to study Saadya's Arabic commentary on the *Sepher Yetzirah* and then to write his own in Hebrew.⁹⁸ This treatise was the first Hebrew book written in Western Europe, and it marked an important transmission of Jewish mystical and mathematical lore from the East. Like Saadya, Donnolo viewed the esoteric traditions as part of a new wave of scientific enlightenment. A celebrated physician, who helped to found Europe's first medical school at Salerno, Donnolo drew upon theosophical teachings to describe man as a microcosm, whose sickness and health depend on the correspondence of natural and spiritual forces. He extended the mystical mathematics of the *Sepher Yetzirah* into theories of physiog-

⁹⁵ I. Efros, *Studies*, 46.

⁹⁶ S. Rosenblatt, *Saadia*, 309.

⁹⁷ E. Goodenough, *By Light*, 369.

⁹⁸ "Donnolo," *EJ*; S. Baron, *History*, VIII, 30, 60; G. Scholem, *Kabbalah*, 28.

nommy and astrology, in which the temple of man reflects the cosmic temple.

Throughout the tenth and eleventh centuries in the Moslem-Jewish world, there was renewed interest in the study of geometry for both scientific and magical purposes. Intricate geometrical configurations produced by guilds of Jewish artists in Egypt were carried to Moslem Spain, where they appeared in illustrated Hebrew Bibles.⁹⁹ Landsberger stresses the striking similarity to later Christian Gothic designs, noting that the main motif is "a quadrangle framing a circle and bordered by four semi-circles."¹⁰⁰ For Jews and Arabs, these squares, circles, rosettes, and knots had magical connotations—a tradition that was preserved in Gothic masonic guilds. Among the Arabs, this interest in magical geometry was associated with a flourishing poetry of architectural symbolism which was part of an enlightenment mentality.¹⁰¹ In the Jewish communities of Spain, the reappearance in medieval Hebrew Bibles of the symbolic figures from the Dura Europa synagogue suggests a similar linking of geometrical and architectural mysticism.

That such a linking was intimately connected with the Jewish building guilds and with actual construction projects is dramatically illustrated in the mystical-masonic interests of Solomon Ibn Gabirol, whose Hebrew poems of "elegant Solomonic heresy" provide a touchstone for the emerging Jewish-Arabic-Christian synthesis that contributed to the bold innovations of Gothic architecture and masonry. Ibn Gabirol (ca. 1021–1059) lived in southern Spain during a brief period of exceptional religious tolerance and scientific and mystical enlightenment. Under various liberal Moslem rulers, Jews and Christians were respected as "people of the Book," and they were allowed to study and work with Moslems in the schools, guilds, and trades.¹⁰² In Granada the Jewish family of Naghrallas helped to plan and construct the new city and, as powerful viziers, they controlled the community's economic and social affairs.

Ibn Gabirol was employed by the Naghralla court and, under its patronage and stimulation, he wrote the learned Arabic philosophical

⁹⁹ J. Guttman, *No Grawn*, xliii–iv.

¹⁰⁰ F. Landsberger, *History*, 200–03.

¹⁰¹ Frederick Bargebuhr, "The Alhambra Palace of the Eleventh Century," *JWCI*, 19 (1956), 242n.33.

¹⁰² Leon Weinberger, *Jewish Prince in Moslem Spain: Selected Poems of Samuel Ibn Gabirol* (Tuscaloosa: Alabama UP, 1973), 4.

treatises and eloquent Hebrew poetry that were to make him a major intellectual influence on medieval philosophy. His patron Samuel Ibn Naghralla came to Granada with the dream of “an imminent re-establishment of a Solomonic kingdom of art, wisdom, and power.”¹⁰³ Naghralla’s secular messianism was nurtured by his studies in “the wisdom of the Greeks” (especially neo-Platonic mysticism), the natural sciences and mathematics (especially Pythagoras, Euclid, Aristotle, and Arabic works), and Jewish Talmudic and literary traditions.

However, an important source for his dream of a new “symbolistic architecture” was the esoteric lore of *Merkabah* mysticism. Combining the mathematical traditions of the *Sepher Yetzirah* with Sufic teachings, Naghralla planned a magnificent fortified palace, to be built on the Alhambra hill, which would embody in intricate stonemasonry and glittering glass his Solomonic vision. Though he died before the construction began, his son Yusuf carried out the plans and completed the magnificent Judeo-Arabic and, strikingly, proto-Gothic building. Until the discovery in 1941 of Ibn Gabirol’s Hebrew poem on “the eleventh-century Jewish Alhambra,” modern historians believed that the original palace was an Arabic construction of the fourteenth century.

The Naghralla family was able to utilize Jews trained in an eclectic and eager building tradition, nourished by a steady exchange of manuscripts, treasures, sages, and craftsmen. Many of the builders came from areas in the Middle East and North Africa where Jews dominated the craft of stonemasonry. In 1068 the Arab geographer and poet Al-Bakri observed that in Morocco the occupation of masonry was the exclusive preserve of the Jews (“le métier de maçon est réservé spécialement aux juifs”).¹⁰⁴ Moreover, the Jews from this region travelled to all the countries of the world, especially to southern Spain, where Al-Bakri (known as “the Cordovan”) participated in the Solomonic renaissance created by liberal Moslems and Jews. Baron concludes that Jews performed pioneering services in introducing new types of masonry and architectural designs into the West.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰³ F. Bargebuhr, “Alhambra,” 192–258.

¹⁰⁴ Al-Bakri, *Description de l’Afrique Septentrionale*, rev. ed.; trans. Mac Guckin de Slane (Paris: Librairie d’Amérique et d’Orient, 1965), 284; also, 11, 19, 226.

¹⁰⁵ S. Baron, *Social*, VIII, 159.

In Cordova and Granada, the Naghralla period was characterized by an exuberant defiance of the Biblical prohibition against “graven images.” Stimulated by an ardent spiritualism, in which physical beauty and erotic desire were seen as emblems of divine nature, and by a love of geometrical and mathematical symbolism, the Naghrallas and their master-builders looked upon King Solomon, “the builder of fabled palaces and temple,” as the “the Biblical champion of these heresies.”¹⁰⁶ Foreshadowing the role of the Gothic “free masons,” who became sculptural artists in freestone, the artists of the Jewish Alhambra brilliantly expressed their guild mysteries in their masonic carvings.

The surviving poetry of Ibn Gabirol gives a clue to the nature of those mysteries. In the celebrated poem *Keter Malkhut* (“The Kingly Crown”), he assimilated Jewish Temple mysticism into neo-Platonic cosmology. After traversing the nine cosmic spheres, the visionary sees the tenth sphere of Intelligence, which is the regenerated Temple.¹⁰⁷ The Temple is created from mystic numerology and architecture: “Thou art One, the first of every number, and the foundation of every structure.” Echoing Philo and the Gnostics, the poet portrays a God who is ineffable but who expresses himself in emanations, especially in that of the Divine Architect:

Thou art wise and from Thy wisdom, Thou has set appart thy appointed Will,
As a craftsman and an artist,
To cause the continuity of Being to emanate from Nothing.¹⁰⁸

Baron notes that Ibn Gabirol makes it clear that Will and Wisdom are “really but two designations of the same original divine tool.” Though the poet uses concrete terms of craftsmanship, he stresses the mystical nature of the labor: “Without tool hath he [Thy Workman] wrought,/Hewing, graving, cleansing, refining.” Throughout the poem, Ibn Gabirol yearns for the rebuilding of the Jerusalem Temple, a desire shared by his fellow esotericists.

The building of the Alhambra palace by Yusuf Ibn Naghralla seemed to fulfill Ibn Gabirol’s mystical as well as secular messianic dreams. In a Hebrew poem dedicated to Yusuf, he gave a vivid

¹⁰⁶ F. Bargebuhr, “Alhambra,” 232.

¹⁰⁷ See Israel Davidson, *Selected Religious Poems of Solomon Ibn Gabirol* (1923; rpt. New York: Arno Press, 1973), 83, 88, 100, 121, 173.

¹⁰⁸ S. Baron, *Social*, VIII, 92.

description of the castle and the figurative art of its interior. For the poet, the fantastic architecture represented the mystical illumination and scientific enlightenment of the Naghrallas and their epoch. He praised the father as a new Solomon and the son as a new Hiram of Tyre, "the father of all inventors," who "wrought all the works of the House of God." The reborn Solomon and Hiram created an architectural design of cosmic symbolism and interior features of magical import. Six tiers of rosettes, with one rosette at the highest point, represented the six heavens and the Empyrean—a design drawing upon geometric, magical, and astrological lore. The wondrous rotating dome, created by illusory window-lighting effects, reflected Eastern aspirations to manipulate the universe in imitative magic.¹⁰⁹ The Jewish architects and craftsmen drew upon Hebrew and Moslem wonder-fables about the magical palaces built by Solomon, in which the royal magician summoned up demonic artisans to aid him in his supernatural construction. Discussing the underlying "illusionistic trend," Bargebuhr concludes that these architects tried to "dematerialize structure into a fairy-tale's web," in order to enact the Solomonic fables.

Ibn Gabirol died while the Solomonic kingdom still flourished, but its reign was comparatively brief. In 1066 an enraged mob of conservative Moslems killed Yusuf Ibn Naghralla and over three thousand leading Jews. During the succeeding period of repressive Moslem rule, Jews, Christians, and liberal Moslems were increasingly persecuted. Many of the artisans migrated northward, where features of their Solomonic art eventually surfaced in northern Europe. The influence of their poetic spokesman, Ibn Gabirol, would soon reach Christian Europe; however, in the confusion of the times, his Jewish identity was lost and he became known as Avicbron—long believed to be an Arabic or Christian philosopher.¹¹⁰ The conception of sublimated matter advocated by Ibn Gabirol was later vigorously rejected by Thomas Aquinas, who viewed the "Arabic" philosopher as a subversive representative of Platonizing tendencies in the thirteenth-century church. Aquinas also chastized the Gothic "architects who call themselves sages" for similar Avicbronist heresies.¹¹¹ As we shall

¹⁰⁹ F. Bargebuhr, "Alhambra," 210, 228.

¹¹⁰ Solomon Munck, *Mélanges philosophiques juives et arabes*, nouv. ed. (1857; Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1955), 283–90.

¹¹¹ Paul Frankl, *The Gothic: Literary Sources and Interpretations Through Eight Centuries* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1960), 35.

see, seventeenth-century students of Rosicrucianism and Freemasonry admired the "Arabic" Avicenna for the very qualities that Aquinas condemned.¹¹²

Despite the attempted repression of Ibn Gabirol's works by orthodox Christians and Jews, he found a brilliant disciple in Abraham Ibn Ezra (1089–1164), who was deeply influenced by Gabirol's *Keter Malkhut* and who carried on his fusion of Sufic and *Merkabah* theories of mathematics and cosmology.¹¹³ Quoting the *Shi'ur Komah* that "he who knows the measurements of the Creator of the Universe is assured of partaking of the world to come," Ibn Ezra undertook intensive research into Greek and Arabic mathematical works, and he became the main channel of neo-Platonic and Islamic mathesis to the Jewish communities of Europe.¹¹⁴ He also claimed that a Jewish traveller who knew Sanskrit visited India, where he met an Indian mathematician who had invented the decimal system. The Jew brought the Indian to the West, where the work was translated into Arabic and stimulated the mathematical revival. Using the *Sepher Yetzirah* and Saadya's commentaries as a base, Ibn Ezra utilized *Gematria* to develop complex and sophisticated mathematical processes, which he then applied to problems in Hebrew grammar and Biblical exegesis.

Ibn Ezra often hinted that he was a member of a secret fraternity, composed of an illuminated elite, whose members wandered through Europe (much like the wandering Sufi guildsmen and Christian stonemasons). In his eclectic search for discussions with fellow scholars and illuminati, he travelled through Italy, France, and England, where he collaborated with Christian scientists and scholars. He even wrote some of his treatises in Latin in order to give them directly to his Christian friends. Ibn Ezra allegedly returned to Jerusalem in his old age, having achieved a European-wide reputation as an inspired sage and polymath. His astrological and mathematical works would later be quoted by Robert Fludd and Athanasius Kircher, two seventeenth-century students of Jewish mysticism, who had a significant influence on the development of Freemasonry.¹¹⁵

¹¹² See *The Works of Thomas Vaughan*, ed. Alan Rudrum (Oxford: Clarendon, 1984), 79–82; Thomas Urquhart, *The Jewel* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic, 1983), 66–68.

¹¹³ "Abraham Ibn Ezra," *EJ*.

¹¹⁴ S. Baron, *Social*, VIII, 148, 160, 179.

¹¹⁵ Raphael Levy, *The Beginnings of Wisdom: an Astrological Treatise by Abraham ibn Ezra* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1939), 14.

In 1130–40 Judah Halevi—physician, poet, and admirer of Ibn Ezra—responded to the turbulent political events in Spain and Israel by composing a dialogue, *The Kuzari*, in which a rabbi justifies to the young king of the Kuzars the unique and superior role of the Jews in history, despite their current scattered and diminished status. Though the Jews had lost their homeland and Temple, they could still achieve access to them through techniques of visualization. Heinemann notes that Halevi was a “visual thinker” (*Augendenker*), whose “inward eye, bent on spiritual experience, was no less keen in its vision than the sensual eye.”¹¹⁶ Drawing on *ma’aseh merkabah* and *Shi’ur Komah*, as well as the *Sepher Yetzirah*, Halevi boldly affirmed the capacity of Jewish prophets to *see* corporealized manifestations of the divine order. He described this visualization in architectural terms: “No building emerges from the hand of the architect unless its image first existed in his soul,” and the “one order is the work of a one-Master, who is God,” the “giver of forms, designs, and order.”¹¹⁷

Wolfson argues that Halevi was influenced by Sufi theories of the inner eye, as developed by the Brethren of Sincerity, and that he achieved real visions of definable forms that were then stored in memory chambers.¹¹⁸ Halevi described a disciplined ritual of meditation by which the “pious man” achieves control over bodily and intellectual functions until he reaches the state of vision:

He directs the organs of thought and imagination, relieving them of all worldly ideas mentioned above, charges his imagination to produce, with the assistance of memory, the most splendid pictures possible, in order to resemble the divine things sought after. Such pictures are the scenes of Sinai, Abraham and Isaac on Moriah, the Tabernacle of Moses, Temple service, the presence of God in the Temple, and the like. He, then, orders his memory to retain all these . . . As soon as harmony is restored, his will power stimulates all his organs to obey it with alertness, pleasure, and joy.¹¹⁹

When Halevi described the visionary process of rebuilding the Temple, he echoed the craftsman’s terminology used by the Brethren

¹¹⁶ Jehudah Halevi, *The Kuzari*, ed. Isaak Heinemann (Oxford: East and West Library, 1947), 11, 13.

¹¹⁷ Judah Halevi, *The Kuzari*, ed. Henry Slonimsky (New York: Schocken, 1964), 228, 231.

¹¹⁸ E. Wolfson, *Speculum*, 166–71.

¹¹⁹ J. Halevi, *Kuzari*, ed. H. Slonimsky, 138–39.

of Sincerity. Moreover, his writings may have influenced Moslem and Christian masonic guilds during periods of cross-fertilization in Spain. His combination of visualization with mnemonic techniques would later emerge in the Art of Memory, a science required in the training of Scottish masons in 1599.¹²⁰ We will return to Halevi's meditation rituals and architectural analogies in Chapter Nine, when *The Kuzari* will be discussed as a significant influence on a circle of Scottish Freemasons in the 1650's—royalist exiles, who like Halevi, lamented the loss of their homeland and Temple.

In the early twelfth century, while Christian architects and stonemasons developed the “innovative” features of Gothic architecture, Jewish architects and masons also embodied their mystic visions in hewn stone. In Angevin England (1066–1290), Jews designed and built palatial stone houses, whose fortress-like quality imitated that of the Jerusalem Temple.¹²¹ Baron argues that Jews brought Palestinian techniques of stonemasonry to England, where they employed Christian labor and instructed them in the new techniques.¹²² In York wealthy Jews contributed to the cathedral building fund and allegedly designed the unusual stained glass window of the North Transept. The “Five Sisters Window” was often called “the Jewish window,” for it featured geometrical designs consistent with the Old Testament prohibition of images and reflected “a Jewish connection with the window's origin.”¹²³ The Jewish influence on the craftsmen who built York Minster is further illustrated by the Jesse Window, which includes a Seal of Solomon enclosing an all-seeing eye and mason's compass.¹²⁴

Jewish architectural and masonic expertise was also utilized in Normandy and northern Europe, where remains of their stone buildings survive today. Baron laments the lack of documentary evidence on Jewish participation in the medieval building trades—“which was evidently extensive in European and Arab areas”—but nevertheless

¹²⁰ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 45–49.

¹²¹ S. Baron, *Social*, IV, 75, 85, 281n.112, 320–21.

¹²² Salo Baron, *Ancient and Medieval Jewish History*, ed. Leon Feldman (New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1972), 250.

¹²³ *The Jews in Medieval York* (York: York Minster Education Department, 1998), 20.

¹²⁴ Despite the infamous massacre of the Jews in York in 1190, the community recovered and achieved its greatest success and prosperity circa 1220–50; see *ibid.*, 15–19.

concludes that Jews pioneered new methods of masonry and performed services in introducing architectural designs into Europe:

Yet they did not seem to find it necessary to describe and elaborate these techniques in special monographs. They apparently relied either on works written in Arabic or Latin or, even more, on the living transmission of actual practices from one generation to another through the training of apprentices.¹²⁵

The complex training of the memory needed to transmit orally these traditions and techniques will be discussed later, in connection with an attempted masonic revival of the “Art of Memory” in Scotland in 1599.

Among medieval Jewish artisans, the resultant guild secrecy about practical masonry was compounded by the secrecy required about their mystical traditions. From the early twelfth century, in the Rhineland, Spain, and southern France, circles of Jewish mystics emerged who revitalized the ancient practices of *Merkabah* and *Hekhalot* mysticism. Calling themselves “Cabalists,” or receivers of “tradition,” these methodical visionaries produced a stream of commentaries on the *Sepher Yetzirah*, which merged neo-Platonic, Hermetic, and Arabic theosophy into Jewish Temple mysticism. Though the original *Sepher Yetzirah* portrayed the ten *sephiroth* mainly as linguistic-mathematical entities, the commentators added emanationist theories that made the *sephiroth* into dynamic potencies within God Himself. By manipulating these potencies through meditation rituals, the adept could perform acts of visionary magic. Thus, when Cabalists wrote about “the craftsman with his hammer,” the entrance of the priest into “the Chamber of Hewn Stone,” and “the secret of the supernal structure,” the ancient Temple mysticism took on a heightened operative significance.¹²⁶ Moreover, this sense of magical creative power was infused into actual building guilds, thus contributing to the aura of forbidden lore that eventually surrounded the masonic fraternities (both Jewish and Christian).

The increasingly powerful role of the architect and mason is also suggested by an early Cabalistic parable, in which the prophet Jeremiah magically creates a homunculus (*golem*) by his meditation

¹²⁵ S. Baron, *Social*, VIII, 159.

¹²⁶ See Joseph Dan, Ronald Kiener, and Moshe Idel, eds., *The Early Kabbalah* (New York: Paulist Press, 1986), 46–47, 50.

and *Gematria*. When the *golem* erases one of the Hebrew letters on his forehead, Jeremiah asks the creature why:

He replied, "I shall tell you a parable. To what may this be compared? An architect built many houses, cities, and courts, and no one could copy his style and no one understood his knowledge or possessed his skill. Then two men forced themselves upon him. He taught them the secret of his trade, and they knew every aspect of the craft. When they had learned his secret and his skills, they began to argue with him until they broke away from him and became independent architects, charging a lower price for the same services. When people noticed this, they ceased to honor the craftsman and instead came to the newcomers and honored them and gave the commissions when they required to have something built."

So too has God made you in His image, shape, and form. But now that you have created a man like Him, people will say: "There is no God in the world other than these two."¹²⁷

A heavenly messenger advises Jeremiah to write the alphabets backward in order to un-create his *golem*. As we shall see, a similar story of masons who illicitly seek the master's secrets would later be elaborated by Christian Freemasons into the legend of the assassination of Hiram Abif.

While the creation of a homunculus was considered a dangerous form of magic, other Cabalistic treatises glorified the architect as the one who bodies forth God's Word (*Torah*) and Wisdom (*Hokhmah*):

... The Holy One, blessed be He, TOOK the primordial TORAH, which is derived from the quarry of repentance and from the source of Wisdom. He emanated by spiritual activity this encompassing Torah to render permanent the foundations of the world from this very inscription, which is the beginning of the emanation of the Holy One, blessed be he. When [this] encompassing Torah was actualized, HE DREW FROM IT A SINGLE NAME. He hewed from it one name whose essence and name are from one quarry and one essence and He called it by one spiritual name, [and that name is] Lovingkindness.¹²⁸

This connection of practical imagery from the stonemasons' craft with spiritual imagery of God's creation of the cosmos provides a peculiarly Jewish context for the development of Gothic architecture.

Early planners of the cathedrals recognized that they would have to utilize workmen trained in foreign quarries and guilds in order

¹²⁷ Ibid., 54–55.

¹²⁸ Ibid., 74.

to achieve the difficult geometrical and engineering tasks required. In 1123 Abbé Suger of Saint-Denis travelled to southern Italy to recruit masons, goldsmiths, and sculptors from abroad in order to realize his dreams of recreating the Temple of Solomon in a Christian church.¹²⁹ That Suger learned about traditions of Jewish Temple mysticism is suggested by the Jewish symbolism portrayed in the church at Saint-Denis. In one window medallion, Christ unveils the Mosaic law and the synagogue; in another, the Ark of the Covenant is borne on four wheels resembling a chariot.¹³⁰ Like the Hebrew prophets, Suger was convinced that the design of his church had been inspired by a celestial vision. His fascination with the Solomonic tradition was provoked by reports of the crusaders who now guarded the Temple mount in Jerusalem, and he deliberately sought out returning knights in order to get first-hand information on Jewish and Arabic traditions about the Temple.

The confluence of Jewish, Arabic, and crusader lore was especially fruitful in Spain, where the early Cabalists initiated a spiritual and architectural revival. Like Abraham Ibn Ezra, who was associated with a secret brotherhood, another Jewish polymath—Abraham bar Hiyya (d. 1136)—was associated with a secretive fraternity, the chivalric order of Knights Templar. Bar Hiyya was given high official status by the Templars when they came to Spain to crusade against the Moslem infidels.¹³¹ Later known as “Savasorda” (corrupted Arabic for “magistrate of the city”), Bar Hiyya was initially employed in Barcelona by a Christian court which recommended him to the Templars. As the knights reclaimed land from defeated Moslems, they called in Jewish land surveyors or “geometricians” to document, map, and divide the territorial acquisitions. Because of his expertise in mathematics, Bar Hiyya was extensively employed by the Templars, who undertook a massive building program in Spain. Moreover, the Templars probably admired his theosophical theories as much as his geometrical capacities.

¹²⁹ Otto von Simson, *The Gothic Cathedral*, rev. ed. (New York: Panteon Books, 1965), xx, 94.

¹³⁰ Emile Mâle, *The Gothic Image: Religious Art in France of the Thirteenth Century*, trans. Dorra Nussey (New York: Harper and Row, 1958), 170–71.

¹³¹ “Abraham bar Hiyya (Savasorda),” *EJ*; on links between Jews and Templars, see S. Baron, *Social*, IV, 37; X, 67, 331.

The linking of Bar Hiyya to the Templars is important, for the heterodox Christian knights may have formed a significant vehicle for the transmission of “Savasordan” mystical mathematics and Temple lore into Gothic building guilds. Other Jewish families in Spain were intimately involved with the Templars; in fact, the Cavallerias of Aragon were called “homines temple” because of their collaboration with the knights.¹³² The multi-national involvement of Jews in Templar financial, trade, and building enterprises would eventually provoke persecution of both groups—on almost identical charges. Moreover, the Templars would play the same allegedly heretical and subversive role within Papal Christianity that some confraternities of Cabalistic and Sufic adepts played in Talmudic Judaism and Koranic Islam.

After the Crusader conquest of Jerusalem in 1099, the Templars were assigned to guard the Dome of the Rock, which was transformed from a mosque into a church. Their quarters were located within the original foundations that remained from the Second Jerusalem Temple. The knights not only took the name “Templars” but dedicated themselves to the Christian preservation of the Temple. However, the Grand Master also viewed himself as a new Solomon, who should proselytise for the universalist Temple cult. Though the first Grand Master, Hugh de Paiens, carried out missions to northern Europe—including Scotland—his successors were elected for life and rarely returned to Europe. Most of the knights remained in the Middle East and Mediterranean, while they aggressively pushed the Moslems out of the Holy Land and southern Europe. As the years passed, many lost touch with the orthodox religious values and prejudices of their homelands—a factor which eventually contributed to their downfall.

While the Templars developed far-flung financial networks and mounted an aggressive building campaign, they utilized Jewish expertise in banking and stonemasonry—which they recognized as rooted in the Jews’ superior mathematical knowledge. Moreover, the complex codes developed to insure the security of financial transactions drew on Jewish number-letter manipulations (*Gematria*). Increasingly cut off from the orthodox Christianity of Papal Europe, the Templars secretly assimilated the mystical mathematical and Temple lore of their Jewish colleagues and, surprisingly, that of their Arabic

¹³² “Cavalleria, de la,” *EJ*.

enemies. Esoteric emblems from Tyrian, Jewish, and Sufic traditions were often carved in Templar building stones.¹³³ Many of these emblems were strikingly similar to the masons' marks carved in Templar and other Gothic churches in northern Europe (and which can still be seen in Scotland).

As Abraham bar Hiyya worked with the Templars, he probably promoted his views—based on extensive research—that the brilliant mathematical and scientific accomplishments of Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, and Euclid were based on their study of Hebraic sources. Moreover, he almost certainly shared his theories of architectural mysticism with them. Well versed in *Merkabah* lore, Bar Hiyya was an admirer of Ibn Gabirol's poetry on the Solomonic Alhambra. In his mathematical treatises, Bar Hiyya utilized extensive masonic and building imagery. In order to understand the Creator, the mathematician and adept must study the "architectonic of the world":

For every edifice may be identified by the stones of which it is composed and put together. Once one establishes their specific number and arrangement, one may understand the structural design of the edifice and reconstruct it according to its original pattern.¹³⁴

Bar Hiyya's *Treatise of Mensuration and Calculation*, written in Hebrew, was one of the most advanced works of mathematical thinking of the age. So eager were Christians for access to the work that Bar Hiyya travelled to northern Italy, where he worked with Plato of Tivoli to translate it into Latin. Bar Hiyya utilized many Euclidean teachings included in a work since lost and only partially preserved in Arabic translation. Baron observes that Bar Hiyya's text has been invaluable in reconstructing some views of the Greek mathematician.¹³⁵ His many writings brought to the Gothic world not only the scientific bases for advances in surveying, architectural designing, and building, but also the theosophic bases for visionary meditation and symbolic arts. As he worked out practical theories of mechanics and optics, he also worked on the "mechanics of vision."

That Bar Hiyya's Templar patrons based their architectural designs on Solomonic precedents is demonstrated in the churches they con-

¹³³ G. Perrot and C. Chipiez, *History*, I, 110.

¹³⁴ Leon Stitskin, *Judaism as a Philosophy: the Philosophy of Abraham Bar Hiyya* (Brooklyn: Bloch, 1960), 207.

¹³⁵ S. Baron, *Social*, VIII 155–59.

structed in London in 1185 and Segovia in 1204. Modelled on the circular plan of the Dome of the Rock, the designs reflected the architects' belief that this was the plan used by Solomon. In 1615 the Stuart king James VI and I—an initiate of Scottish Freemasonry—would be informed that the Templars in London were so devoted to “the most holy and famous Temple of Jerusalem” that they designed their church to “look like a Jewish temple or synagogue.”¹³⁶ Moreover, this report was based on the preserved documents of the masons who built the Templar church.

The use of the Syrian pointed arch, which became the prototype of Gothic architecture, was evidently brought to Europe by Jewish building guilds.¹³⁷ In early synagogues a pointed arch was carved out of stone to house the Ark of the Tabernacle, and in later ones the arch evolved into an apse—foreshadowing the appearance of the pointed arch in European architecture after the eleventh century. Though Christopher Wren suggested that the Gothic arch was Saracenic in origin, its transmission more likely occurred through Jewish interpretations of the “infidel” Moslem structure. At Chartres, where a Jewish community of scholars thrived, Bishop Peter of Celle introduced the pointed arch in 1170–80 as part of his Solomonic building program. An erudite student of Jewish tradition, Peter declared that the Tabernacle was not built with human hands or earthly materials but belongs to the celestial world. However, Moses himself “meant to direct the minds of the initiated, by means of the work he was building, to the spiritual vision that lay behind it.”¹³⁸ The Gothic architects' replacement of walls by glass was probably influenced by the Book of Enoch and the *Hekhalot* literature, which had earlier found brilliant expression in the Jewish Alhambra. The portrayal of scenes from the Old Testament on the stained glass also drew heavily on Jewish expertise in glass making, theories of optics, and *Merkabah* mysticism.¹³⁹

Among the most magnificent of Gothic windows were those designed under the direction of Suger at Saint-Denis. He paid tribute to Jewish mystical traditions, and he dramatized the yearning of crusaders to

¹³⁶ Edmund Hawes, *Annales, or, a General Chronicle of England* (London, 1615), 1069–70. To be discussed further in Chapter Five.

¹³⁷ See Rachel Hachili, “The Niche and the Ark in Ancient Synagogues,” *Bulletin of American Schools of Oriental Research*, 222 (1976), 43–50.

¹³⁸ O. Simson, *Gothic*, 192–93.

¹³⁹ Zoe Josephs, “Jewish Glass-Makers,” *TJHSE*, 24 (1970–1973), 107–09.

restore the Temple. In 1150, in the midst of his great building project, Suger was urged by the king of Jerusalem and the Pope to rouse support for a new crusade. Planning to join the crusaders, he sent money diverted from the church building fund on to Jerusalem, and he utilized the Templars for the transaction.¹⁴⁰ However, his declining health meant that Suger could only express his "Templar" ambitions in stained-glass windows depicting the First Crusade and Charlemagne's legendary pilgrimage to the East. After he was "called to the heavenly Jerusalem," Suger's Solomonic vision was expressed by other Gothic architects and master masons.

In the wake of the Moslem re-conquest of Jerusalem by Saladin in 1187, many Jews preferred to live in the remaining territories controlled by crusaders. A large number fled to territories governed by the Templars, who now shared the ancient Jewish yearning for reclamation of the Temple. In their architecture, the Templars drew on Jewish mystical traditions and current synagogue designs to express their reverence for the Temple. The knights' use of carved and knotted columns was based on Jewish traditions about Jachin and Boaz, the symbolic columns in front of Solomon's Temple. When the synagogue at Worms, destroyed by earlier crusaders, was rebuilt in 1174, one column featured a carved reference to Jachin and Boaz (I Kings 7:44) with its esoteric *Gematria*.¹⁴¹ At the same time in Worms, a circle of Ashkenazic Jews called the *Hasidim* (pietists) revitalized study of the *Sepher Yetzirah* and *Merkabah* mysticism. In 1225 in Würzburg, where the local bishops undertook research on the Temple and possibly made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, the cathedral featured explicit references to the Solomonic Temple on a pair of monumental columns bearing the inscription Jachin and Boaz. Cahn points out that similar columns in southern France and Italy deliberately evoked the magical powers attributed to Solomon and the occult significance of carved knots.¹⁴²

At a period of vigorous cross-fertilization between Jewish, Moslem, and Christian architects and masons, it is significant that a brilliant Hebrew prophet attempted to broaden access to the visionary tech-

¹⁴⁰ E.A. Brown and M.W. Cothren, "The Twelfth-century Crusading Window of the Abbey of Saint-Denis," *JWCI*, 49 (1988), 1-40.

¹⁴¹ Walter Cahn, "Solomonic Elements in Romanesque Art," in J. Guttman, *Temple*, 45-72.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 51.

niques of the *Sepher Yetzirah* and *Merkabah* and to attract Jews and Christians to his messianic movement. Moreover, his emphasis on the mystical process of “untying the knots” had a direct relevance to the masons’ carved knots, which—as Lesser suggests—drew on Jewish magical lore about “untying the knots” of Solomon’s Seal, David’s Star, and other amulets.¹⁴³ Abraham Abulafia (1240—after 1292) was born in Spain but travelled widely in the Middle East, Sicily, and Italy.¹⁴⁴ A great admirer of the erudition and rationalism of Maimonides, Abulafia sought to merge the sage’s respect for the active intellect with his own discoveries in visionary Cabala. Initially influenced by the *Merkabah* mysticism of the German *Hasidim*, he also assimilated material from Sufi and Christian mystics. Though he failed in his effort to meet and convert the Pope, Abulafia’s teachings did provide a bridge between the two religions—which, to his dismay, resulted in the apostasy to Christianity of some of his disciples.

Like Swedenborg five centuries later, Abulafia analysed rationally and scientifically his own bodily and mental processes, while he practised meditation and breathing rituals dedicated to achieving a state of ecstatic trance. Elaborating the *Gematria* of the older mystics into fantastically complex mathematical-linguistic computations, he developed techniques of memorization and combination that required an intense activation of the intellectual faculties. In his manuals of instruction, which circulated widely and exercised great influence on Christian Cabalists, there are suggestive parallels to later Masonic developments in knot, ladder, angel, and music symbolism and in Masonic techniques of the Art of Memory. In one remarkable treatise, he described a circle with a three-dimensional ladder inside, a series of moveable overlapping cubes, and the parts of the body—all to be visualized by the intensely concentrating mystic.¹⁴⁵ In another he instructed the adept in a process of concentration that removes the mind from “natural objects” in order “to unseal the soul, to untie the knots that bind it.” Scholem points out that Abulafia’s technique paralleled Yogic techniques found in northern Buddhism.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴³ George Lesser, *Gothic Cathedrals and Sacred Geometry* (London: Alec Tirante, 1957), I, 11.

¹⁴⁴ G. Scholem, *Major Trends*, 130–55; Moshe Idel, *The Mystical Experience in Abraham Abulafia*, trans. Jonathan Chipman (Albany: State University of New York, 1988).

¹⁴⁵ Schlomo Pines, *Studies in the History of Jewish Thought*, eds. W.Z. Harvey and Moshe Idel (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1997), 109–117.

¹⁴⁶ G. Scholem, *Major Trends*, 131.

While Abulafia democratized and intellectualized the ancient Jewish visionary techniques, he also made explicit the erotic symbolism of the *Sepher Yetzirah*, as he described the coupling of letters and numbers, soul and intellect, in terms of sexual intercourse. Unlike his contemporaries in Spain, who described a sexual praxis in the *Zohar*, Abulafia advocated a visionary sexual coupling within the mind, which by complex intellectual combinations, could produce a state of orgasmic pleasure in the brain.¹⁴⁷ The wide distribution of Abulafia's Hebrew manuscripts meant that Jewish and Christian craftsmen possibly became aware of his symbolism and techniques at a period when apostasy from both religions was a two-way street.¹⁴⁸ Moreover, the artisan fraternities of both religions boasted of their increasing independence, mobility, and freedom from orthodox clerical control.

During the same period when Abulafia made exoteric the esoteric "science of sciences," his contemporary Moses de Leon and a network of Cabalists in Spain produced the eloquent texts of the *Zohar*, which developed daring theories of sexual dynamics within the sephirotic system. Though the *Zohar* treatises were mainly written in an artificial Aramaic that could only be understood by rabbinical scholars, they also reflected a period of sexual libertinism and theosophical experimentation in the Jewish communities of Spain, which was paralleled by Christian heretics in southern France and Italy. Probably composed in the 1290's and issued text by text (not in the form of a complete book), the *Zohar* added colorful new elements to the traditions of architectural mysticism transmitted by *Merkabah* and *Hekhalot* traditions.¹⁴⁹ Like the architects and artisans of their Christian Gothic contemporaries, the Jewish craftsmen of earthly and celestial temples were perceived with reverence and awe.

Merging the mathematical imagery of the *Sepher Yetzirah* into more recent emanationist theories, the *Zohar* increased the sense of divine power and mystery involved in the architecture of cosmic creation. While meditating on a problem of *Gematria*, a Cabalist was visited by the spirit of Elijah who enlightened him:

When the most Mysterious wished to reveal Himself, He first produced a single point with innumerable designs, and engraved . . . a

¹⁴⁷ Idel, *Studies*, 204–05.

¹⁴⁸ L. Newman, *Jewish Influence*, 52–59.

¹⁴⁹ See Fischel Lachower and Isaiah Tishby, eds., *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, trans. David Goldstein (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989), III, 867–908.

wondrous edifice issuing from the midst of thought . . . It desired to become manifest and to be called by a name . . . The letters of the two words intermingled, forming the complete name ELOHIM (God) . . . And upon this secret the world is built.¹⁵⁰

As we shall see, the “rabbinic mystery” of the Mason Word, a secret of Scottish Freemasonry, was rooted in this Cabalistic tradition.

Moving from the relative abstraction of the mathematical-linguistic point, the *Zohar* then drew increasingly on architectural imagery:

We must picture a king who wanted several buildings to be erected, and who had an architect in his service who did nothing save with his consent. The king is the supernal Wisdom above, the Central Column being the king below; *Elohim* is the architect above, being as such the supernal Mother, and *Elohim* is also the architect below, being as such the Divine Presence (*Shekinah*) of the lower world . . . When he desired anything built in the way of emanation (*aziluth*), . . . the master of the building gave the order, and the architect carried it out immediately . . . When he came to the “world of separation,” which is the sphere of individual beings, the architect said to the master of the building: “let us make man in our image, according to our likeness.”¹⁵¹

Not only was the universe created by the holy Hebrew language, but the *Torah* itself embodied the divine architectural plan. In fact, the *Torah* was the architect:

When the Holy One resolved to create the world, He guided Himself by the *Torah* as by a plan, as has been pointed out in connection with words, “Then I was by him as *amon* (Prov. VIII, 30), where the word *amon* (nursling) may also be read *uman* (architect). Was *Torah*, then, an architect? Yes, for if a King resolves to build him a palace, without an architect and a plan, how can it proceed? . . . When the Holy One, blessed be He, resolved to create the world, He looked into His plan, and, although, in a sense, it was the plan which brought the world palace into being, it is not called by its name, but by that of the King. The *Torah* proclaims: “I was by Him an architect, through me He created the world!”—for the *Torah* preceded the creation of the world by two thousand years; and so, when He resolved to create the world He looked into the *Torah*, into its every creative word, and fashioned the world correspondingly.¹⁵²

¹⁵⁰ Maurice Simon and Harry Sperling, eds., *The Zohar* (1934; rpt. New York: Soncino, 1973), I, 6. Unless otherwise indicated, all quotes are from this edition.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, I, 91.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, IV, 56–57.

To create the earthly Tabernacle and Temple required a human architect and artisans who could perceive the celestial plan. Drawing on earlier *Midrash* accounts, the *Zohar* described Moses as a building foreman who oversaw the construction project:

The Temple, then, was designed as an ever-enduring resting-place for all the legions, all the symbols, all the solemn works, on the model of the celestial Temple; but the Tabernacle was the same, only on a small scale.

Observe that when Moses was commanded to make the Tabernacle, he could not comprehend its design until God showed him an exact replica of every single part . . . Still Moses found the work difficult, and though he was shown it eye to eye, as it were, he was reluctant to undertake it. Now it cannot be thought that he lacked the skill or the knowledge for the work, for though Bezalel and Aholiab and the others with them did not see what Moses saw, yet it is written of them: 'And Moses saw all the work, and, behold, they have done it, etc.' (Ex. XXXIX, 43) . . . But the truth is that Moses withdrew himself from the work of the Tabernacle, yet was the whole work done by his direction and under his supervision.¹⁵³

For Moses de Leon's Christian neighbors, the role of Moses would clearly duplicate that of the Gothic "master of works," who performed the dual role of architect and artisan. Later Christian Freemasons would build on this Jewish tradition to portray Moses as the first Grand Master of their fraternity.

The role of Bezalel as master-mason to Moses received new embellishments. Bezalel not only "knew how to combine those letters of the Alphabet by which heaven and earth were created," but he also possessed the letters engraved on "the divine rod which was in Moses' hand, and on which there was engraved the divine ineffable Name radiating in various combinations of letters."¹⁵⁴ However, the *Zohar* hints at a certain uneasiness about the exalted role of Bezalel, as shown in its argument that Moses was really in charge of the construction. The etymologies of Bezalel's name include "in the very shadow of God," "the son of primeval light," and "the son of absolute freedom." Moreover, God recognizes that the creative builder has a tendency to independence and pride. God prohibited Adam and Eve from eating of the tree of knowledge because they would assume god-like powers. The serpent, on the other hand, urged Eve: "Eat

¹⁵³ Ibid., IV, 320–21; F. Lachower, *Wisdom*, III, 874.

¹⁵⁴ *Zohar*, I, 38.

you of it and you shall create worlds. It is because God knows this that He has commanded you not to eat of it, for every artisan hates his fellow of the same craft.”¹⁵⁵

When Solomon built the Temple, he too was threatened by the independent pride of the master mason:

“God gave Solomon wisdom”; and how did Solomon display this wisdom that God gave him? First in this way, that he made Hiram assume a more modest frame of mind. For we have been taught that Hiram at first set himself up as a god, as it is written: ‘Thou has said, I am a god, I sit in the seat of God’ (Ezek. XXVII, 2). Solomon, however, in his wisdom induced him to give up these claims, and he deferred to him, and therefore it is written, “and there was peace between Hiram and Solomon.” (I Kings V, 26).¹⁵⁶

Thus, “when a man begins to set up a building he should declare that he is building for the service of God.”¹⁵⁷ These caveats may reflect concerns shared by church fathers, such as Aquinas, and orthodox rabbis about the increasing independence and spectacular accomplishments of contemporary masonic guilds. Moreover, popular opinion still equated mathematical expertise with forbidden magic—an opinion that was reinforced by the apparently supernatural construction of the towering cathedrals, with their profusion of occult and “Judaized” symbols.

In the *Zohar*, the master craftsman Bezalel is also credited with designing the crowned pillars that represent the male and female potencies of the *sephiroth*:

HOOKS (*vau*-shaped tops) FOR THE PILLARS. The *vau* is symbolic of the male principle. All that exists and ascends with the dignity of anointing on high is of the male principle, which is typified by the *vau*, the symbol of heaven, which is male; whereas all below are called female . . . Hence all those *vavim* (*vaus*) that Bezalel made over the pillars that represented the female principle. These spring from the mystery of the number thousand, which is a complete number, as well as seven hundred . . . and, further, from the number five and seventy, all of which together represent one mystery. Thus, out of that mystery, and that number, he [Bezalel] made the *vavim* (*vaus*); so all was made with a deep symbolism, and according to a certain calculation.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., I, 134.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., V, 46.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., V, 19.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., IV, 277.

The pillars called Jachin and Boaz, which became central symbols of Freemasonry, were especially fraught with sexual significance:

It is written: "A river went forth from Eden" (Gen. II,10). . . . it is called life, because life issues thence to the world . . . that river sends forth deep streams with the oil of plenitude to water the Garden of Eden and feed the trees and the shoots. These streams flow on and unite in two pillars which are called Jachin and Boaz. Thence the streams flow on and come to rest in a grade called Zaddik, and from hence they flow further till they all are gathered into . . . the sea of Wisdom.¹⁵⁹

As the waters of sexual generation flow back and forth, the Zaddik or righteous one is united in intercourse with the Matrona (*Shekinah*)—"When these two are joined, all worlds have gladness and blessing, and there is peace among upper and lower beings."

The heightened sexual symbolism of Jachin and Boaz was paralleled by that of the Cherubim in the Holy of Holies. Since the destruction of the Second Temple, the position of the Cherubim has been reversed from face-to-face in copulation to back-to-back in estrangement. Their dilemma reflects that of the lower and upper worlds, the female and male elements within God. Through devoted meditation and prayer, the Cabalistic adept can re-unite the Cherubim and the *Shekinah* with God. Angered by the sexual permissiveness that was widespread among the wealthy Jewish classes, Moses de Leon sought to reform his fellows by stressing the sacramental and cosmic significance of Jewish sexuality.¹⁶⁰ Ironically, his powerful descriptions of divine eroticism would later provoke charges of carnality and obscenity against students of the *Zohar*. In one passage describing the union between God and Zion, he used what Patai describes as an "unusually daring homily":

The male member is the completion of the entire body [of God the King] and it is called *Yesod* (Foundation), and this is the feature that delights the Female, and all the desire of the Male for the Female which in this *Yesod* penetrates the Female at the place called Zion, for there is the covered place of the Female, like unto the womb in a woman. This is why the Lord of Hosts is called *Yesod*. It is written: "For the Lord hath chosen Zion, He hath desired it for his habitation"—when the Matronit is separated from Him. And she unites with

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., V, 38.

¹⁶⁰ Yitzah Baer, *A History of the Jews in Christian Spain*, trans. Louis Schoffmann (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of American, 1971), I, 262–63.

the King face to face on the Sabbath even, and both become one body . . . When the Matronit unites with the King all the worlds are blessed and all are in a state of great joy . . . and the Matronit becomes intoxicated with joy and blessed in the place that is called the Holy of Holies here below . . .¹⁶¹

The combination of flamboyant eroticism and utopian idealism expressed in the *Zohar* paralleled that of Islamic and Christian troubadour poetry. However, the Cabalists' detailed descriptions of the proper behavior of husband and wife necessary to make their humble bed the participant in the divine marriage was unique in its explicitness. Like the students of Abulafia, the student of the *Zohar* could bring about the presence of the *Shekinah* through his meditation process, without the act of intercourse, but the sexual act itself was also to be undertaken with full devotion, ritual, and joy.¹⁶²

Jewish artisans in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Spain evidently discussed Zoharic themes in their guild meetings.¹⁶³ After the expulsion of the Jews in 1492, the artisans who fled to the Middle East brought with them a tradition of group study of the texts, while they undertook a revival of their craft enterprises. This "democratization" of esoteric-erotic interpretations of the architectural and mathematical interpretations of the *Torah* is especially relevant to the transmission of Cabalistic traditions within Christian masonry, because there was cross-religious participation in building projects by Jewish, Christian, and Moslem guildsmen during the early period of Zoharic diffusion. While the *Zohar* amplified the sexual symbolism of the ancient traditions of Temple mysticism, it also heightened the spiritual significance of the masons who built the Temple. In terms that curiously echo those of the Comacine masonic fraternity, the *Zohar* revealed the magical aspects of the masonic labor:

R. Simeon began his discourse with the verse: And the house in its being built, was built of stone made ready at the quarry; and there was neither hammer nor axe nor any tool of iron heard in the house in its being built (I Kings VI,7). He said: The phrase "in its being built" (*behibbonotho*) implies self-building, as though without the hands of artisans. Were not then, Solomon with all his work people engaged in the work of building? . . . In reality it [Temple] was made of itself, by a miracle. So soon as the artisans set their hands to the work, it

¹⁶¹ *Zohar*, III, 296a-b, Idra Zutta; quoted in Patai, *Man and Temple*, 231.

¹⁶² See F. Lachower, *Wisdom*, III, 1355-1406, on "Conjugal Life."

¹⁶³ M. Wischnitzer, *History*, 108, 124, 139-40.

showed them how to proceed in a manner quite novel to them . . . in the building of the Sanctuary. It was built of its own accord, though seemingly by the hands of labourers; it showed the workers a design which guided their hands and from which they did not turn their eyes until the whole building of the house was completed . . . “And there was neither hammer nor axe nor any tool of iron heard in the house in its being built” (*ibid.*), because the *shamir* [stone-cutting insect] performed all the splitting without any sound being heard. No cutting tools were thus required, the whole work being accomplished by a miracle.¹⁶⁴

As we shall see, many symbolic details of Cabalistic traditions would emerge in later Masonic rituals and documents where, divorced from their Jewish guild origins, their meaning was lost to their Christian heirs.

While Christian crusaders often wreaked havoc on Jewish communities in Germanic territories, the “Israelites” in northern France, Italy, and Spain were spared such persecutions.¹⁶⁵ Moreover, some of the crusading orders treated the Jews more tolerantly than did their Moslem foes. In Spain, especially, the Jews supported the Templars financially and militarily, as they pushed the Moors steadily southward. Thus, for better or worse, the fates of these Christian and Jewish exiles from Jerusalem seemed increasingly linked. Liebes argues that the *Zohar* reflects the messianic expectations that were provoked in Spain by the defeat of the last crusader strongholds in Palestine in 1291.¹⁶⁶ The Mameluke conquest of Acre, which severed links between Israel and Spain, disrupted the collaboration between Jewish traders and the Templar and Hospitallers in the Mediterranean.¹⁶⁷

Having encouraged Jewish enterprise in building and finance for decades, the Templars now shared in the Jewish economic decline that ramified from the Middle East into Spain in the late thirteenth century. The social discontent which troubled Spain, Italy, and southern France fanned religious discontent, which erupted in a spate of Christian heretical movements—often characterized as “Judaizing” because of their emphasis on Old Testament teachings.¹⁶⁸ This turbulent period, when the mystical and messianic messages of Abulafia

¹⁶⁴ *Zohar*, I, 251–52.

¹⁶⁵ “Crusades,” *EJ*.

¹⁶⁶ J. Liebes, *Studies*, 67, 128.

¹⁶⁷ Y. Baer, *History*, 210.

¹⁶⁸ L. Newman, *Jewish Influence*, 133–83.

and Moses de Leon spread among artisan as well as rabbinic circles, would soon erupt in the sensational trial of the Knights Templar—an event fraught with significance for later Masonic tradition but still fraught with controversy about its historical realities.

Throughout the thirteenth century, the ambitious construction projects of the Templars led to their increasingly intimate association with the building guilds, in which Christian and Jewish artisans worked together on many projects. By the 1290's, the Grand Master of the Templars, Jacques de Molay, acted as the patron of a French *compagnonnage*, a craft and religious fraternity that claimed ancient Eastern origins.¹⁶⁹ According to the oral traditions preserved by the *compagnonnage*, the initiated builders (stone-masons, carpenters, glaziers, etc.) called themselves “Sons of Maître Jacques” and “Sons of Solomon.”¹⁷⁰ Maître Jacques allegedly left France to study architecture in Greece; then, “hearing that Solomon had summoned to himself all famous men, he passed into Egypt and thence to Jerusalem.” On orders of the chief master, (Hiram?), he constructed two columns (Jachin and Boaz?) and thus rose to become “one of the first masters of Solomon and a colleague of Hiram.” Jacques and his French co-workers claimed that Solomon gave them a charge and incorporated them fraternally in the Temple. Preparing to return to Gaul, Jacques chose thirteen “Companions” and forty disciples. Though these events were supposed to have taken place nine centuries before Christ, the *compagnonnage* obviously developed the traditions in medieval times.

The subsequent history of Maître Jacques was almost certainly linked with that of the Templars and probably with the Templars' Jewish allies in the artisan guilds. Early in his reign, the French king Philip the Fair attempted to take advantage of Jewish expertise and resources in his struggle against the Papacy. While he protected the Jews from the ecclesiastical courts, he also tried to bring them—and their wealth and property—under his control. However, from 1288 on, Philip protested the Jews' increasing status and wealth, as well as their collaboration with Christian heretics.¹⁷¹ In 1293 he accused the Jews of proselytizing in France, and in 1299 he charged them

¹⁶⁹ G. Sarton, *Introduction*, II, 153.

¹⁷⁰ Agricole Perdiguer, *Le Livre du Compagnonnage* (Paris, 1841); R. Gould, *History*, I, 214–36.

¹⁷¹ L. Newman, *Jewish Influence*, 293, 312, 321, 380, 409.

with receiving and concealing heterodox Christians, especially to protect them from the Inquisition. However, four years later, when the Inquisition accused the Jews of usury and sorcery, he forbade the priests from acting on the charges in his lands. By 1306, complaining about the great number of copies of the Talmud in the possession of Jews, the king issued a decree of expulsion from France.

While Philip persecuted the Jews and confiscated their property, he also launched an investigation of the Templars, whom he linked with the Jews as heretics and subversives.¹⁷² In 1307 he suddenly ordered the arrest of all Templars in the kingdom; within a few weeks he triumphantly announced that over five hundred prisoners had confessed to heresy charges.¹⁷³ The Templars had earlier been accused of collaborating with the Saracens, but now the charges hinted at their assimilation of “Jewish” vices. Most obviously, the Templars all wore beards, a habit prohibited for most religious persons and extremely rare among other knights. The religious significance of the beard and the reverent attitude towards it among Jewish Cabalists was well known in France. After confessing their guilt, the Templars ritualistically shaved their beards. As charges accumulated, the Templars were portrayed as the Devil’s agents, who sought to betray and break down “the house of the people of God.”

During their initiation ceremonies, the Templars allegedly denied that Christ was the Son of God, spat three times on a cross, promised to relieve their sexual desires with other brothers, and bestowed worship on a heathen idol called “Baphomet.” The persecution spread from France, and thousands of Templars were arrested and tried from Cyprus to England. Though contemporary critics such as Spinola and Dante credited the persecution to the greed of Philip the Fair, later scholars view the trials as the precursors of the great European witch scares, in which charges of black magic were used to exterminate independent, heterodox, and subversive thinkers, as well as simple folk. Some historians argue that the Templars maintained a secret phallic worship—a charge that was also made against contemporary Jewish heretics by Christian inquisitors and orthodox rabbis.¹⁷⁴

¹⁷² S. Baron, *Social*, X, 67, 331n.14.

¹⁷³ Peter Partner, *The Murdered Magicians: The Templars and their Myth* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1982), 59–85.

¹⁷⁴ E. Wolfson, *Speculum*, 369–75, on “seeing the unveiled phallus” and the “homosexuality of the mystical fraternity” as part of Zoharic rituals.

While he cracked down on Jews and Templars, Philip launched a similar campaign against the craft guilds.¹⁷⁵ Just as he had condemned the Jews for spreading copies of the Talmud among the populace, he opposed the spread of scriptural knowledge among the Christian lay community by the narrative art carved in stone and illuminated in glass in the Gothic cathedrals. These “masonic” Bibles of the illiterate masses were conducive to heresy, while the proliferating craft fraternities were becoming dangers to the state. Thus, in 1308 Philip banned the craft fraternities, especially in southern France, where mystical and democratic heresies flourished among both Jews and Christians. The execution of Jacques de Molay in 1314 was a blow not only to the Templars but to the *compagnonnage*, who subsequently developed a tradition of the betrayal of Maître Jacques by one of his fellow masons, Maître Soubise.¹⁷⁶ The legend of Jacques’s assassination by false brethren among the Sons of Solomon seemed to merge the hints at tensions between Jewish and Canaanite artisans in the *Zohar* with the story of Judas’s betrayal of Christ.

According to *compagnonnage* oral tradition, Jacques’s death was connected with “the destruction of the temples”—probably a reference to the fate of the Knights Templar and their last Grand Master. The Sons of Maître Jacques then distributed articles of his clothing to different groups of artisans: “After the division . . . the act of faith was found which was pronounced by him on the day of his reception before Solomon, Hiram, the high priest, and all the masters.” According to Gould, the Sons of Solomon utilized many rituals (such as charges, oaths, degrees, white gloves, etc.) which emerged in later Freemasonry.¹⁷⁷ The lack of written documents on the medieval *compagnonnage* is probably related to the persecution of the Templars and the continuing tradition of secrecy and oral instruction by the craft fraternities.

When accusations of heresy among the *compagnonnage* were published in Paris in 1655, it became clear that the fraternities had maintained their old Solomonic traditions. Perdiguer, who first printed the legendary histories in 1841, drew on manuscript as well as oral transmission.¹⁷⁸ Moreover, he suggested that the Sons of Solomon

¹⁷⁵ Jean-Pierre Bayard, *Le Compagnonnage en France* (Paris: Éditions Payot, 1977), 80–84.

¹⁷⁶ R. Gould, *History*, I, 218–19.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, I, 195.

¹⁷⁸ Agricole Perdiguer, *Le Livre du Compagnonnage* (Paris, 1841).

and the Freemasons, though not known to each other until 1715, derived from common anterior sources. It is tempting to speculate that these sources were rooted in the Jewish and Christian masonic guilds and in their martyred patrons, the Templars.

The implementation of expulsion orders against Jews and Templars was not carried out consistently by various rulers, and unknown numbers escaped to more tolerant kingdoms. In the far north, the embattled kingdom of Scotland allegedly received an influx of refugees, who would secretly infuse their heterodox Jewish and Templar traditions into local customs and political affairs. From this clandestine development—preserved in oral history and seventeenth-century polemical literature—emerged many of the Solomonic and chivalric traditions that would create “modern” Freemasonry.

CHAPTER TWO

REBUILDING THE TEMPLE IN THE NORTH: FROM SOLOMONIC MYSTICISM TO SCOTTISH MASONRY (1128–1513)

The first Christian Prince that expelled the Jews out of his territories, was that heroick King, our Edward the First, who was such a scourge also to the Scots; and it is thought diverse families of the banished Jews fled to Scotland, where they have propagated since in great numbers; witness the aversion that nation hath above all others to hogs-flesh.

—James Howell, *History of the Latter Times of the Jews* (1653)

The Branch of the Lodge of Solomon's Temple, afterwards called the Lodge of St. John of Jerusalem is as I can easily prove, the Antientist and Purest now on Earth. The famous old Scottish Lodge of Kilwinning of which all the Kings of Scotland have been from Time to Time Grand Masters without Interruption down from the days of Fergus . . . [who] was carefully instructed in all the Arts and Sciences, especially in the natural Magick, and the Cabalistical Philosophy . . . Speaking of the *Cabala*, as *Masonry* was call'd in those Days . . .

—Jonathan Swift, *Letter from the Grand Mistress of the Female Freemasons* (1724)

One of the major stumbling blocks in Masonic research is the difficulty of documenting the peculiar and persistent claim that not only Templars but Jews escaped to Scotland, where they exerted a secret but powerful influence on the development of Freemasonry. When Swift anonymously published his *Letter from the Grand Mistress* (Dublin, 1724), he launched a satirical missile into a current power struggle between Jacobite and Hanoverian Freemasons. In opposition to Whig-English claims to be originators of “authentic” Masonry, Swift presented rival Tory-Celtic traditions which had accumulated in the lodges patronised by Stuart monarchs. Though this Masonic letter was attributed to Swift by his friends and earliest editors, it has been strangely ignored by his modern critics.¹ However, by delving into

¹ [Anon.], *Letter from the Grand Mistress of the Female Free-Masons to Mr. Harding the*

the historical roots of the Cabalistic-Scottish developments in Freemasonry, it will become clear that Swift had access to genuine lodge traditions, which his Jacobite friends would have recognized. To arrive at Swift's eighteenth-century Masonic milieu and to comprehend his satire, we must journey back to the "foundation myths" of Scotland and their ramifications in medieval Scottish history.

Given Scotland's geographical remoteness from the southern scenes of early Cabalistic and Gothic development, its role as a repository and transmitter of medieval Jewish-Arabic science and theosophy may seem implausible. However, from at least the eleventh century A.D., Scots had prided themselves on their racial descent from the ancient Egyptians of Mosaic times.² Because this nationalistic myth provided a nurturing context for the development of early Scottish Freemasonry, a summary of its motifs by Matthews will be useful:

In the time of Moses, there was a spirited young Greek, Gathelus of Athens, who . . . decided to try his fortunes abroad. Egypt was then under attack by Indians and Moors, so Gathelus and his friends offered their services to Pharaoh, and under the command of Moses they helped defeat the invaders . . . when Moses fell into disfavor, Gathelus was made general of the Egyptian army . . . he was also given the hand of Pharaoh's daughter Scota. From this marriage it is that Gaels and Scots trace both their names and their descent.

. . . when Egypt was stricken by the plagues, Gathelus resolved to seek a new home. With Scota and his children, and a multitude of Greeks and Egyptians, he set forth . . . and at length settled in Galicia in northern Spain . . . There Gathelus founded Brigance, also known as Compostella, and called his followers Scots in honor of his wife.³

As the myth developed, Gathelus was portrayed as the friend and confidante of Moses—a point that would later prove relevant to the Jewish and Cabalistic traditions preserved in Scottish Masonry.⁴

Printer (Dublin, 1724); reprinted in Appendix to Jonathan Swift, *Prose Works*, ed. Herbert Davis (Oxford: Shakespeare Head, 1962), V, 324–33, 358–59. See argument for Swift's authorship by John Herron Lepper and Philip Crossle, *History of the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of Ireland* (Dublin: Lodge of Research, 1925), I, 448.

² Edward J. Cowan, "Myth and Identity in Early Medieval Scotland," *SHR*, 63 (1984), 111–35.

³ William Matthews, "The Egyptians in Scotland: The Political History of a Myth," *Viator* (1970), 291–92.

⁴ William Donaldson, *The Jacobite Song* (Aberdeen: Aberdeen UP, 1988), 6.

Gathelus administered justice from a marble chair which bore a Latin inscription: “*Ni fallat fatum, Scoti quocumque locatum/Inuenient lapidem, regnare tenentur ibidem,*” which was popularly translated:

Unless the fates be faulty grown
And prophet's voice be vain
Where'er is found this sacred stone
The Scottish race shall reign.

The “Stone of Destiny” accompanied the Scots on their subsequent migrations, and it took on increasingly nationalistic significance. At some point, it became identified with the stone that the Hebrew patriarch Jacob used for a pillow, when he achieved a vision of angels. The magical and visionary powers associated with the stone would later feed into Scottish traditions of “second sight” or clairvoyance.

Meanwhile in Spain, the numbers of Gathelus's followers became so large that he sent his son Hiber to a northern island, which he named Hibernia (Ireland). After the inhabitants submitted peacefully to his rule, Hiber left a garrison there and returned to Spain. When relations between the natives and settlers in Hibernia broke down, they chose Simon Brek (a descendant of Gathelus and Scota) to rule them. In 695 B.C. Brek brought the marble chair from Spain and became the first king to reign over the Scots in Hibernia. A few generations later, the Scots sent settlers to a new land, which they called Scotland. In 330 B.C. Scotland became an independent kingdom under King Fergus I, and “Jacob's pillow” was encased in a coronation chair at Scone. Except for a temporary Roman-Pictish defeat, the descendants of Fergus reigned as independent monarchs for the succeeding centuries. According to Scottish chroniclers, “the Scots always preserved the freedom that had been theirs from the beginnings in Egypt,” despite continuous attacks by their southern neighbors.⁵

With this Egyptian-Mosaic-Spanish myth as background, the role of medieval Scottish advocates of Jewish and Arabic learning in the development of Scottish national consciousness becomes comprehensible. In fact, one of the foremost intellectual contributors to the multicultural mystical synthesis was Michael Scot (fl. 1217–ca. 1240), who left his native Scotland and studies at Oxford and Paris in quest of Hebrew and Arabic learning. A brilliant polymath, Scot worked with Jews and Moslems in Toledo, Spain, where he read Aristotle's

⁵ W. Matthews, “Egyptians,” 291.

scientific works in Arabic and Maimonides' *Guide to the Perplexed* in Hebrew.⁶ Scot collected Jewish magical treatises and incorporated the number symbolism of the *Sepher Yetzirah* into his mathematical, astronomical, and linguistic theories. He then travelled to Italy, where in 1220 he entered the service of the heterodox Frederick II, Holy Roman Emperor and King of Sicily. Often at odds with the Papacy, Frederick was a free-thinker who welcomed Jews and Saracens to his court in Palermo.

In Sicily Scot worked with Jacob ben Anatoli (1194–1256), a Jewish savant, on Latin translations of the works of Aristotle, Maimonides, and other non-Christian philosophers. Anatoli, who had been educated in the Cabalistic centers of Provence, ranked Scot as “his second master by the side of Samuel Ibn Tibbon,” the Jewish scholar who allegedly discussed Jewish rituals with Frederick.⁷ Like Anatoli, the Tibbon family contributed to the dissemination of Judeo-Arabic science and mysticism from Spain into Provence. Samuel Ibn Tibbon produced important Hebrew translations of Euclid and Arabic mathematical works, as well as allegorical commentaries on the “Song of Songs.”⁸ It is unknown whether Scot met Tibbon, but Newman characterizes the friendship between Scot and Anatoli as “one of the most significant in the history of medieval thought.”⁹ Fascinated by Solomonic traditions, Scot gained access to Jewish and Arabic mystical works on mathematics, physiognomy, alchemy, and magic.

Inspired by his experience at Frederick's tolerant court, Scot espoused a proto-Renaissance confidence in man's intellectual abilities, for “man is said by his genius to surpass angels and demons, known and unknown.”¹⁰ Though he warned about the arrogance and dishonesty of many *magi*, he also wrote extensively on the techniques and powers of various magical arts. His theories on exoteric and esoteric mathematics would influence later Freemasons, for he distinguished “between *mathesis*, or knowledge, and *matesis*, or divination, and *mathematica*, which may be taught freely and publicly, and *matematica*, which is forbidden to Christians.”¹¹ Scot's emphasis

⁶ Lynn Thorndike, *Michael Scot* (London: Thomas Nelson, 1965).

⁷ L. Newman, *Jewish Influence*, 297–98, 352.

⁸ “Tibbon, Family of,” *EJ*.

⁹ L. Newman, *Jewish Influence*, 296–97, 357–58.

¹⁰ L. Thorndike, *Michael Scot*, 57.

¹¹ Lynn Thorndike, *The History of Magic and Experimental Science* (New York: Macmillan, 1928–58, II, 319.

on the role of “living memory” in attaining enlightenment also provides an early foreshadowing of the emergence of the “Art of Memory” in Scottish masonry in 1599.

Michael Scot also had a rare opportunity to participate in a crusade that resulted in a temporary victory for religious tolerance. In 1223 Frederick met with the Pope, the king of Jerusalem, and the Grand Masters of the Templars and Hospitallers, who urged him to lead an army to the Holy Land. Though he dutifully married the child queen of Jerusalem and sent a military force towards Acre, he aborted the military expedition and was thus excommunicated by the Pope. Frederick then independently set out for Acre, where he carried out friendly negotiations with the Moslems in 1229.¹² The brilliant Arabist Scot, who accompanied the emperor, must have been employed during these discussions. By promising that the Christian and Moslem religions would meet with equal toleration in Jerusalem, Frederick won the peaceful surrender of the Holy City. When the emperor and his party first arrived in Palestine, they were welcomed by the Templars and Hospitallers; however, the Pope then sent orders to the knights to refuse to cooperate with the excommunicated Frederick. The Christian Patriarch of Jerusalem complained to the Pope that the new king of Jerusalem was so determined to render good service to his kind friend the sultan of Egypt that he removed all the military machines and arms from the city, before he embarked secretly for Europe.

Michael Scot made notes on his observations in Palestine, and his experiences would have been of great interest to his fellow scholars in the British Isles. Thus, when Scot visited Oxford and Scotland circa 1230, he brought with him a unique knowledge of Jewish-Arabic-crusader developments that would later find their peculiar expression in Scottish Freemasonry. Faivre, in his study of “The Ancient and Medieval Sources of Modern Esoteric Movements,” stresses the seminal role of Scot in bringing Arabic theosophical methods to the West.¹³ Scot’s Latin translation of Averroes showed how the Moslem philosopher “made a clear distinction between esotericism and exotericism, the complementary nature of which can

¹² Charles Addison, *The Knights Templar History*, ed. Robert Macoy (1842; New York: AMS, 1978), 341–42.

¹³ Antoine Faivre and Jacob Needleman, eds., *Modern Esoteric Spirituality* (New York: Crossroad, 1995), 46, 52, 71–100.

be understood thanks to a spiritual exegesis, the *ta'wil*." Though Averroes preferred the exoteric method, Scot followed the esoteric path; he saw no inconsistency in translating the rationalist Aristotle of Averroes and the occultist pseudo-Aristotle of Arabic and Jewish mystics. For him, the *ta'wil* unveiled spiritual truths and was thus consistent with his own theories of microcosmic and magical "analogies and correspondences of every kind."

According to Scottish tradition, Scot was buried in Melrose Abbey, and his books of magic were either buried with him or hidden in the convent. Scot also developed a posthumous reputation as an arch-magus, who crossed the boundaries of permitted magic. Dante placed him in Hell, because of his knowledge of "the illusive grace" of "magical deceits."¹⁴ Boccaccio claimed that Scot left disciples in Florence, who organized an egalitarian club of occultists to carry on his alchemical work. That Scot had earlier worked with Jewish and Moslem alchemists makes his multi-cultural and cross-class tolerance seem an odd foreshadowing of the Scottish Masons who would later study his works. In 1805, when Sir Walter Scott (an active Freemason) described "Auld Michael" as a Scottish patriot, Cabalistic magician, and "infernal architect" who built a great stone bridge across the Tweed, he was working out of a long fraternal tradition.¹⁵

The impact of Michael Scot on Oxford in 1230 was observed by the young Roger Bacon (1214–1294), who recorded the sensation the visitor caused when he expounded on the mathematical and scientific works of Aristotle. Though Bacon praised Scot as "a notable inquirer into matter, motion, and the course of the constellations," he also seemed envious of Scot's reputation and claimed that his famous translations had really been done by "Andrew the Jew."¹⁶ Stimulated by Scot's expertise in Hebrew lore, Bacon studied with Jewish scholars in France, who introduced him to the works of Avicbron (poetic spokesman of the Solomonic renaissance), Abraham bar Hiyya (mathematical protégé of the Templars), and various Cabalists (builders of the visionary Temple). In his *Opus Majus* (1267), Bacon credited Scot with opening up the world of Aristotelian science through his translations from the Arabic.

¹⁴ E.J. Holmyard, *Alchemy* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968), 217–18.

¹⁵ See his "Lay of the Last Minstrel," in Walter Scott, *Castle Dangerous* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1923), 187–91, 355–61.

¹⁶ L. Thorndike, *History*, II, 314; L. Newman, *Jewish Influence*, 64–66, 78–88, 118.

However, the *Opus* also asserts that Aristotle and the Arabs were merely the heirs of an originally Jewish revelation. Bacon here drew upon the similar argument expressed by the Sufi “Brethren of Sincerity,” whose encyclopedic treatises on mystical mathesis greatly influenced his own scientific attitude.¹⁷ As noted in Chapter One, this Sufi fraternity adopted the terms and organization of the craftsmen’s guilds, and some scholars argue that the “Saracenic origins” of Freemasonry can be traced to its activities.¹⁸ Like Scot, Bacon merged his Judeo-Arabic studies into a Solomonic vision of science. He argued that when the ancient Jews received the law of God, they simultaneously received the full measure of philosophy, for one could not unaided acquire the principles of the sciences and arts but needed a revelation.

For Scottish readers who treasured their tradition of Gathelus serving under Moses in Egypt, Bacon’s synthesis of Jewish and Egyptian lore was especially attractive:

Joseph instructed the princes of Pharaoh and taught the old men of Egypt prudence, and Moses was skilled in all the wisdom of the Egyptians. Bezaleel and Aholiab also . . . had a full grasp and knowledge of the things of nature; for with one breath the Holy Spirit illumined them and taught them the whole of nature’s power in metals and other minerals. But Solomon, wiser than all preceding or following him . . . possessed the full power of philosophy. Josephus . . . adds that Noah and his sons taught the Chaldeans the parts of philosophy, and that Abraham entered Egypt and taught the Egyptians. And he adds that Solomon left no part of nature unexamined . . . [and] composed four thousand and five books . . .¹⁹

Not only the Egyptians but all the Greek philosophers—Thales, Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle—received their wisdom from the Jews. The great Hermes, who lived at the time of Moses, passed on Jewish wisdom to his grandson, Hermes Trismegistus, who merged Jewish and Egyptian wisdom.

To prove these points, Bacon drew frequently on the pseudo-Aristotelian *Secretum Secretorum*, which (like Scot) he believed to be authentic. This strange work, which appeared in many variant texts

¹⁷ G. Sarton, *History*, II, 246.

¹⁸ J. Trimmingham, *Sufi Orders*, 25; I. Shah, *Sufis*, xix n.4, 340–44.

¹⁹ Roger Bacon, *The Opus Majus*, trans. Robert Burke (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania UP, 1928), 52–53.

from the tenth century on, was a compilation of neo-Platonic, Arabic, and Hebraic astrological, magical, and alchemical lore.²⁰ In one twelfth-century version of the *Secretum*, which drew on the *Sepher Yetzirah*, the converted Jew Petrus Alfonsi argued that the Hebrew letters of the Tetragrammaton can be expressed in a triangular diagram, thus using Cabalistic and geometrical “proofs” for the trinity of persons in the divinity.²¹ Alfonsi allegedly visited England, where copies of his *Secretum* were noted by Bacon’s contemporaries. Bacon himself was familiar with the mystical numerologies of the *Sepher Yetzirah* and the techniques of geometrical visualization taught by *Merkabah* mystics. From his conversations with Jews in their Gallic speech, he may have learned the oral traditions concerning these operative techniques.

Noting that there are seven heads under which we must employ mathematics, Bacon stressed the importance of the fifth head, which advocates the visualization of geometrical-architectural forms:

Since artificial works, like the ark of Noah, and the temple of Solomon and of Ezechiel and Esdra . . . are placed in Scripture, it is not possible for the literal sense to be known unless a man have these works depicted to his sense, but more so when they are pictured in their physical forms . . . we should see as though present all the other symbols of that ancient people. Then after the unstable tabernacle swaying to and fro has been removed we should enter the firm temple built by the wisdom of Solomon. And with Ezekiel in the spirit of exultation we should sensibly behold what he perceived only spiritually, so that at length we should enter a larger house decorated with a fuller glory . . . Therefore I count nothing more fitting for a man diligent in the study of God’s wisdom than the exhibition of geometrical forms of this kind before his eyes.²²

Though Bacon believed that Judaism was inferior to Christianity, he deprecated current efforts to convert the Jews. Remembering Scot’s debt to Jewish scholars, he continued to seek contact with learned rabbis.²³ In fact, it was probably his “Judaizing” activities that led to his imprisonment in a Paris convent.

²⁰ L. Thorndike, *History*, II, 267–77; W.F. Ryan and C.B. Schmitt, *Pseudo-Aristotle, The Secret of Secrets: Sources and Influences* (London: Warburg Institute, 1982).

²¹ Roger Bacon, *The Mirror of Alchemy*, ed. Stanton Linden (New York: Garland, 1992); Alfred Büchler, “A Twelfth-Century Physician’s Desk Book: The *Secreta Secretorum* of Petrus Alphonsi Quondam Moses Sephardi,” *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 37 (1986), 206–12.

²² R. Bacon, *Opus*, 232–34.

²³ L. Newman, *Jewish Influence*, 87.

In England false charges of proselytizing were made against the Jews, which culminated in a royal order of expulsion in 1290. A murky but persistent tradition developed that many of the Jews fled to Scotland, beyond the reach of English law. Over the next decades, when Scotland was temporarily ruled by England and engaged in a nationalist resistance movement, the refugee Jews allegedly merged into the population and infused various Jewish customs into the Scottish lifestyle.²⁴ Meanwhile, south of the border, the fleeing Jews left behind manuscripts and books, and many came into Bacon's possession. After his death, a profusion of Cabalistic and alchemical texts were issued under his name, which further elaborated the mystical lore of the Temple, the magical properties of the "Ineffable Name," and the "ars notarica" of *Gematria*. Bacon's advocacy of Jewish-Arabic scientific and magical lore for the development of experimental science would later undergo a revival during the reign of the Stuart king, James VI and I, an initiated Freemason who saw himself as "Scotland's Solomon."²⁵ Jonathan Swift would later draw on this Scots-Irish tradition when he identified Roger Bacon as a Free-Mason and promised a forthcoming publication of "Fryar Bacon on Free-Masonry . . . soon to be dress'd up in Modern English."²⁶

Despite the condemnation by Thomas Aquinas of Avicbron's theories of "sublimated matter," Bacon's support of Cabalistic and neo-Platonic Jewish philosophers was shared by another Scot, John Duns Scotus (1266–1308). Like Michael Scot earlier, Duns Scotus left his northern homeland in search of Hebrew and Arabic learning. In Paris he studied with a Jewish instructor and developed great admiration for Jewish mathematical and mystical learning.²⁷ Through further Jewish contacts, there emerged a reciprocal influence on their respective philosophical writings.²⁸ In *De Rerum Principio*, Duns Scotus

²⁴ See James Howell, *The Wonderfull, and Most Deplorable History of the Latter Times of the Jews, of the City of Hierusalem* (London, 1653), Epistle Dedicatory; John Toland, *Reasons for Naturalizing the Jews in Great Britain and Ireland* (London, 1714), 37–38; Arthur Williamson, "'A Pil for Pork-Eaters': Ethnic Identity, Apocalyptic Premises, and the Strange Creation of the Judeo-Scots," in R.B. Waddington and A.H. Williamson, eds., *The Expulsion of the Jews: 1492 and After* (New York: Garland, 1994), 237–58.

²⁵ See ahead, Chapters Four and Five.

²⁶ J. Swift, *Prose*, V, 328, 330.

²⁷ P. Frankl, *Gothic*, 35.

²⁸ Shlomo Pines, "Scholasticism After Thomas Aquinas and the Teachings of Hasdai Crescas and His Predecessors," *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities*, 1 (1967), 3, 23–50.

declared that he wished to return to the standpoint of Avicbron, in direct contrast to Aquinas. Newman observes that,

In his opinions concerning the belief that not only corporeal but spiritual substance is compounded of matter and form, in his metaphysical and cosmological system, based upon the doctrine of a unitary, universal substance underlying all created things, both corporeal and spiritual, and in other important points, Scotus follows step by step upon the teachings of Avicbron.²⁹

Duns Scotus applied his vitalistic theories even to stones and metals, which “live with an imperfect sort of life, although our dull senses do not comprehend that life.”³⁰ The stones feel and have a great variety of veins, which are signs of “a certain degree of life.” This doctrine of living stones, found also in Jewish mystical lore concerning the Temple, was not only favorable to natural magic but to natural science. While maintaining a “strong scientific and mathematical bent” and advocating “natural science as a legitimate discipline,” Scotus also believed that astrology and alchemy were reputable sciences. Like Scot and Bacon, Scotus believed in the authenticity and usefulness of the *Secretum Secretorum*.

By expounding this eclectic philosophy at the University of Paris, Scotus created a receptive audience for the more sweeping multiculturalism of Ramon Lull, who travelled from Spain to Paris to bring his message of Jewish-Moslem-Christian enlightenment. Slipping into Scotus’s classroom, Lull provoked a vigorous discussion and soon “silenced both lecturer and audience with a magnificent improvisation upon the perfection of the Divine Nature.”³¹ This odd meeting of Lull and Scotus, who were both credited with supernatural illumination, points forward to the peculiar blending of Judeo-Arabic mysticism from Spain with Solomonian architectural developments in Scotland—a blending that eventually produced Freemasonry.

Born in Majorca in 1235, Lull grew up in a mixed Christian-Moslem-Jewish culture.³² After pursuing a troubadour’s sensual delights and serving as seneschal at the court, Lull experienced a visionary con-

²⁹ L. Newman, *Jewish Influence*, 120.

³⁰ L. Thorndike, *History*, III, 3–7.

³¹ E. Allison Peers, *Ramon Lull: A Biography* (London: SPCK, 1929), 323–24.

³² J.N. Hillgarth, *Ramon Lull and Lullism in Fourteenth-Century France* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971), 2.

version and undertook a study of the scientific, philosophic, and mystical teachings of the three great religions. While he conversed with Moslem Sufis and Jewish Cabalists, he also studied the writings of John Scotus Erigena, the ninth-century Irish philosopher, whom medieval commentators believed to be Scottish (he was called "John the Scot").³³ Though Erigena's theories were condemned by church councils during his lifetime, there was a revival of interest in his mystical cosmology among Christian and Jewish "heretics" in Spain and Provence in the early 1200's.³⁴ Lull found in the Christian Erigena a visionary cosmology capable of assimilating the Jewish and Moslem theosophy he was currently investigating. Thus, Erigenism became Lull's vehicle for developing a universalist religion in the name of a *Pax Christianus*.

Erigena translated from Greek into Latin a treatise on angelic hierarchies attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite, which was possibly composed in Palestine. Dionysius drew on concepts in early Jewish Gnosticism as well as neo-Platonism, and he often hinted at a secret technique of achieving vision which was taught only to initiates. Erigena revealed that through graduated stages of illumination, the initiate can be regenerated, angelized, and deified, a process "symbolized by entrance into the outer porticoes of the temple of Solomon."³⁵ Fascinated by mathematics and geometry, Erigena developed "a mystic sense of the building of the Temple of Solomon," which contains "the measure by which all things (in the eschaton) are measured."³⁶ Erigena's theosophy influenced Azriel of Gerona and other Jewish theosophers, who perceived similarities between his Temple mysticism and that of the *Sepher Yetzirah*, and between the angelic hierarchies and the *sephiroth*.³⁷ Wolfson discusses the similarities between

³³ Most modern scholars believe he was Irish, but some still argue for his Scottish nationality. See Frances Yates, "Ramon Lull and John Scotus Erigena," *JWCI*, 17 (1954), 115-69.

³⁴ J. Hillgarth, *Ramon Lull*, 3, 34.

³⁵ P.A. Dietrich and D.F. Duclow, "Virgins in Paradise: Deification and Exegesis in 'Periphyseon V,'" in G.H. Allard, ed., *Jean Scot Écrivain* (Paris: Cahiers d'Études Médiévales, 1986), 31-37.

³⁶ James McEvoy, "Biblical and Platonic Measure in John Scottus Eriugena," in Bernard McGinn and Willemien Otten, eds., *Eriugena: East and West* (Notre Dame: Notre Dame UP, 1994), 159.

³⁷ Gabrielle Sed-Rajna, "L'influence de Jean Scot sur la doctrine du kabbaliste Azriel de Gérone," in *Jean Scot Érigène et l'histoire de la philosophie* (Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1977), 453-462.

Erigena and certain Jewish visionaries, for whom the study of the *sephiroth* itself “was considered an exercise in imaginary visualization.”³⁸

That Erigena’s neo-Platonic, Jewish interpretation of the Temple was considered a “Scottish” philosophy would become important in the later development of *Écossais* Freemasonry.³⁹ That a major transmitter of Erigenism to Scotland was the Spaniard, Ramon Lull, would also influence that development. Lull merged Erigena’s angelic hierarchies with the Cabalists’ *sephiroth*, while he developed his own theory of the *dignitates* or attributes of the divine cosmos. Idel argues that Lull had access to techniques of ecstatic Cabala, similar to those taught by Abulafia and described in contemporary Hebrew treatises on the *Sepher Yetzirah*.⁴⁰ Lull’s practice of Cabalistic as well as Sufic meditation techniques probably produced his visionary “illumination” on Mount Randa, when he *saw* the structure, nature, and coherence of the divine cosmos. In surviving Cabalistic treatises, there are striking parallels with Lull’s use of geometrical diagrams to express the *ars combinatoria*, which he developed to explain the manifestation and visualization of divine attributes. Yates observes that “in its most secret application, the Art works out the structure of the universe in terms of the circle, the triangle, and the square.”⁴¹

Though Lull had encyclopedist and conversionist aims for his Art, it was essentially “an art of prayer and contemplation . . . but above all, an art of predestination, which would revise and correct the popular arts of divination.”⁴² His usage of images of the tree of knowledge and the ladder between terrestrial and celestial worlds drew on Cabalistic techniques of moving back and forth between the *sephiroth* and up and down between earth and heaven. Lull’s contribution to these ancient visionary techniques was a rationalization and mechanization that made his Art seem practical and scientific. Pring-Mill argues the importance of his Art to the development of scientific thinking:

After a mystical illumination . . . Lull saw that everything could be systematically related back to God by examining how Creation was structured by the active manifestation of the divine attributes—which he

³⁸ E. Wolfson, *Speculum*, 204, 280, 293.

³⁹ Since 1986 an *Écossais* lodge in Paris has published *Cahiers Jean Scot Erigène*, dedicated to his “scientific competence and Masonic interest.”

⁴⁰ Moshe Idel, “Ramon Lull and Ecstatic Kabbalah,” *JWCI*, 51 (1988), 70–74.

⁴¹ Frances Yates, “The Art of Ramon Lull,” *JWCI*, 17 (1954), 155.

⁴² J. Hillgarth, *Ramon Lull*, 8.

called Dignities and used as the absolute principles of his Art. Examining their manifestations involved using a set of relative principles; and both sets could be visualized in combinatory diagrams . . . All early versions had a set of supplementary visual aids . . . [The Art's] combinatory nature . . . led to both the use of complex semimechanical techniques that sometimes required figures with separately revolving concentric wheels . . . and to the symbolic notation of its alphabet.⁴³

Pring-Mill thus includes Lull's *ars combinatoria* among the forerunners of modern symbolic logic and computer science, "with its systematically exhaustive consideration of all possible combinations of the material, reduced to a symbolic coding."

However, the main reason for Lull's use of circle, triangle, and square was to assist the memory—especially for students who were not sophisticated in abstract philosophical terminology.⁴⁴ In developing this Art of Memory, Lull seemed to draw on contemporary Cabalistic treatises, which utilized a "ladder of contemplation" and "chambers of the memory."⁴⁵ In one Sufi-influenced Cabalistic treatise, the student meditates on thirteen *middoth* or attributes of God, which include concepts such as emanation, creation, formation, action, force, craft, ability for realization, etc. Unlike Roger Bacon, whose work he probably knew, Lull did not want to confine this meditative and mnemonic art to a secretive elite but to spread it through vernacular languages and exemplary diagrams to all segments of the population.

Lull was familiar with the teachings and methods of the Sufi "Brethren of Sincerity" which inspired him to include craftsmen in his aims.⁴⁶ Given the alleged influence of the Sufi fraternity on early masonic guilds, it is not surprising that Lull's treatises on geometry, measurement, and mechanical arts would generate interest among architects and stonemasons, especially in Spain and Scotland. When Swift later asserted that "a Key to *Raymundus Lullius*" is necessary "to come at the Quintessence of *Free Masonry*," he testified to the

⁴³ F.D. Pring-Mill, "Ramon Lull," in Charles Gillespie, ed., *Dictionary of Scientific Biography* (New York: Charles Scribner, 1973), VIII, 547–51.

⁴⁴ J. Hillgarth, *Ramon Lull*, 214–15; Frances Yates, *The Art of Memory* (Chicago: Chicago UP, 1966), 173–98.

⁴⁵ See Gershom Scholem, "A Note on a Kabbalistical Treatise on Contemplation," in Seyyed Hossein Nasr, ed., *Mélange offerts à Henry Corbin* (Tehran: Tehran UP, 1977), 668–69.

⁴⁶ Ramon Lull, *Selected Works of Ramon Lull*, ed. Anthony Bonner (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1985), I, 292n.26.

endurance of this Cabalistic-Sufic-Lullian influence in Scottish and Irish lodges.⁴⁷

Lull's primary ambition was to use the universalist principles of his Art to convert the Jews and Moslems by rational argument. Because his Dignities were so similar to the Moslem *hadras* and Jewish *sephiroth*, the unbelievers would follow his arguments that the Christian trinity and incarnation provide the logical nexus of the cosmic structure. While Lull travelled in Spain, North Africa, the Middle East, Italy, and France, he constantly revised and simplified his Art, hoping to make it increasingly accessible to infidels and the unlearned. At the same time, he appealed to kings and popes to utilize his Art in a great conversionist crusade that would also reclaim the Holy Land. Thus, he issued plans for the re-education, reformation, and unification of the crusading orders—who would add the force of arms to the force of argument.

Meeting frequently with the Knights Templars and Hospitallers, Lull tried to enlist them for a peaceful crusade. In 1275 he wrote the *Book of the Order of Chivalry*, in which he laid out a program of regeneration and illumination for the knights. Responding to widespread international interest in the manual, Lull followed it with an even more popular chivalric romance, *Blanquerna* (1283), in which a young peasant educates himself by using Lull's Art and eventually becomes Pope Blanquerna. Lull then made a revealing admission of his debt to Sufi visionary techniques. Through his mouthpiece Blanquerna, he recalls that

... a Saracen had told him that the Saracens had certain religious men, among whom the most highly considered were those called "sufis," and that these men had words of love and brief examples which aroused great devotion in men. These are words which require exposition, and by their exposition the understanding rises up higher, and carries the will with it, increasing its devotion.⁴⁸

Blanquerna then advises the "Masters of the Temple and of the Hospital" that they should arrange schools "wherein their knights should learn certain brief arguments, by means of the *Brief Art of Finding Truth*, and so maintain the Holy Faith by "feats of arms or

⁴⁷ J. Swift, *Prose*, V, 328. Swift would also satirize Lullian logic machines in *Gulliver's Travels*.

⁴⁸ Anthony Bonner, *Doctor Illuminatus: A Ramon Llull Reader* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1993), 189.

by learning.”⁴⁹ As an example, Lull described a knight who is also a priest “of the Order of Science and Chivalry.” The knight who masters his encyclopedic Memory system becomes an “artista,” who thus gains extraordinary powers for his crusade.

In the 1290’s, when Philip the Fair began his campaign of defiance against the Pope, Lull’s colleague at the University of Paris, Duns Scotus, opposed the French king’s position and thus left Paris for Oxford. Lull, however, hoped the aggressive Philip would lead a new crusade, and he presented his plan for the reformation and unification of the military orders. He then travelled to Cyprus, where he urged King Henry de Lusignan (the deposed king of Jerusalem) to join his conversionist campaign. Though Henry was not interested, Lull found a sympathizer in Jacques de Molay, Grand Master of the Templars, who “cheerfully received” Lull into his house in Limassol for several weeks in 1302.⁵⁰ At this point, Lull believed the Templars were capable of reformation and service in the crusade, which suggests that De Molay responded positively to his argument for the role of Lullian Art in the training of knights.

From Cyprus Lull possibly visited Jerusalem before returning to the University of Paris and a successful series of lectures on his Art and crusading project. By 1306 his arguments stimulated Philip the Fair to issue calls for an expedition to the East, but Jacques de Molay wrote to Pope Clement V to complain of the French king’s unrealistic assessment of Moslem military strength and the difficulties of merging the Templars and Hospitallers.⁵¹ De Molay argued that only a vast army of twenty thousand men, secretly levied, would have a chance of success; moreover, he suspected that the hypocritical French king could not possibly raise such an army. When Philip began his campaign of persecution against the Templars in 1307, Lull was in prison in Algeria and probably knew little of the bizarre charges issued against De Molay and the knights.

In 1308 Lull was shipwrecked at Pisa, where he worked to organize a new “Order of Christian Religious Knights” who would join the French king’s proposed crusade. In a petition sent from Pisa, Lull included the Templars in his plans for a unified order, while he called for the establishment of schools to train missionaries in

⁴⁹ Yates, “Art of . . . Lull,” 142.

⁵⁰ E. Peers, *Lull*, 305; A. Bonner, *Doctor Illuminatus*, 33–34.

⁵¹ P. Partner, *Murdered Magicians*, 39; J. Hillgarth, *Ramon Lull*, 73–100.

Hebrew and Arabic who would accompany the crusaders. However, by March 1309 Lull had acquiesced in Philip's attack on the Templars and thus issued a revised plan, entitled *Book on the Acquisition of the Holy Land*. Lull's compatriots, the Catalan bishops, resisted the suppression and refused to accept the guilt of the Templars. Lull did not completely capitulate to Philip, however, for he did not believe that the king or his son should be Grand Master of the new order but rather a religious knight who would obey the Pope.

In 1309 Lull also travelled through Italy to encourage the negotiations of the Grand Master of the Hospitallers with the Pope, as the knights outfitted a fleet for an attack on Rhodes. This planned crusade stimulated great popular support, and it attracted nearly forty thousand volunteers from Scotland, England, France, and Germany. Provocatively, many of these would-be crusaders were manual workers, who were scornfully rejected by the Hospitallers. Lull, however, realized their potential usefulness, and he wrote *Ars Brevis*, a simplification of his system that he believed could be mastered by knights and craftsmen as well as clerics and kings. In the posthumous legends that developed about Lull, his collaboration with the Grand Master of the Hospitallers included alchemical work by "certi socii" (particular or faithful associates). This alleged secret society would later be claimed as the forerunner of the Rosicrucian fraternity.⁵²

Certainly, much of the symbolism in the *Ars Brevis* would surface in later Rosicrucian and Masonic treatises—for example, the merging of triangle, ladder, and copulation images:

... existing in each angle of this triangle is the ladder by which the intellect ascends and descends, so that it can find the natural middle term ... Then there is the middle of mensuration, which refers to the act existing between the doer and doable, like loving between the lover and the lovable ...⁵³

As he appealed to knights and craftsmen, Lull also utilized drawings of trees, ladders, and a female wisdom figure—which drew on Cabalistic visualization of the sephirothic tree, *Merkabah* ladder, and divine *Shekinah*. The similarity of Lull's Art to that of Jewish mystics

⁵² A.E. Waite, *The Brotherhood of the Rosy Cross* (1924; New York: Barnes and Noble, 1993), 8–9.

⁵³ R. Lull, *Selected Works*, I, 583–84.

is suggested by Wolfson's comments on the latter, for whom the vision of the divine Presence "involves an intensely erotic experience."⁵⁴ Moreover, "the ocularcentric orientation of theosophic kabbalists is related to a phallocentrism that informs every aspect of their religious thinking and practice."

Leaving the Knights Hospitaller in Italy, Lull returned to Paris, where he called for radical reforms in religion, medicine, education, and finance. In the pseudo-Lullian treatises that proliferated after his death in 1316, claims were made that Lull visited England in 1311 and produced alchemical gold for King Edward II.⁵⁵ In an account that would later have Masonic significance, Elias Ashmole (an initiate of Stuart military masonry) asserted in 1652 that "Cremer, sometime Abbot of Westminster" met Lull in Italy and subsequently invited him to England, where Lull tried to recruit Edward II to his international crusade against the Turks.⁵⁶ Having produced alchemical gold for the king, Lull was outraged when Edward "violated his faith in destroying Christians in stead of Mahometans." Refusing to collaborate further with the king, Lull was arrested and after a long imprisonment in the Tower, "he begun to study his Freedom" and managed to escape to France. To preserve Lull's secrets, Cremer ordered that a hieroglyphical design of the "Hermes Bird" be painted on an arch in Westminster Abbey.⁵⁷

Ashmole's Anglocentric account glossed important variants in the Lullist tradition. As Pereira demonstrates, in different and more extensive versions that preceded Ashmole's, the "English" king was named Robert.⁵⁸ However, the later Lullists missed the more accurate identification, which pointed to King Robert I, the Bruce, of Scotland. Some authors claimed that Lull withdrew from the English monarch because "King Edward, instead of conquering Jerusalem, took up arms against the French." Again, the actual target of Edward's aggression

⁵⁴ E. Wolfson, *Speculum*, 42, 285.

⁵⁵ Michela Pereira, *The Alchemical Corpus Attributed to Raymond Lull* (London: Warburg Institute, 1989), 11, 19, 37–47.

⁵⁶ Elias Ashmole, *Theatrum Chemicum Britannicum* (1652), ed. Allen Dubus. Sources of Science, No. 39 (New York: Johnson Reprint, 1967), xx, 465–67. Misled by his English source, Ashmole mistakenly identifies the king as Edward III and misdates Lull's visit to 1337 (Lull died in 1316).

⁵⁷ Ashmole reports, with dismay, that Cromwell's soldiers defaced the Lullist emblem from the arch in Westminster Abbey, as part of their iconoclastic attack on "Papist," Stuart images.

⁵⁸ M. Pereira, "Alchemical Corpus," 49.

in 1311 was misidentified, for he took up arms against the Scots, whose leader Robert I sought French assistance in his nationalist struggle. If Lull was really imprisoned in London, then Robert's supporters may have assisted his escape. Unlike Edward, Robert yearned to lead an international crusade against the Moslems.

Though the story of Lull's contact with King Robert is probably apocryphal, it does suggest the spread of Lullism into the northern nation—perhaps facilitated by the association of the Bruce dynasty with the Templars and Hospitallers. Moreover, because the Lullist Art of Memory re-surfaced in late sixteenth-century Scottish Freemasonry, it is worth examining the turbulent history of the crusading orders—Lull's designated transmitters of his illuminist Art—in the nationalistic rivalries between Scotland and England.

In the eighteenth-century, *Écossais* Freemasons claimed their descent from the operative masons employed by the Knights Templar, who found a welcoming refuge in medieval Scotland.⁵⁹ Though the tradition was undoubtedly embellished to serve Jacobite political needs, its attractive power was rooted in long-held popular identification of crusading ideals with Scottish nationalism. The early impact of the Templars on the Scottish concept of Solomonic kingship can be verified from the records, and it was the Scottish king David I (ruled 1124–1153) who most fully embodied and implemented the knights' spiritual and ethical ideals.⁶⁰ Inspired by his tutor Bishop John of Glasgow, who visited the crusaders' bases at Jerusalem and Acre, King David maintained a life-long interest in the Holy Land and the struggle to recover the Temple.

In 1128 Hugh de Paiens, first Grand Master of the Knights Templar, travelled to Scotland and met with David. Sent by Baldwin, king of Jerusalem, to recruit Scots for a siege of Damascus, Hugh won the admiration of the Scottish king. Despite the ultimate failure of the siege, Hugh's visit had a more permanent effect, for he impressed upon David the virtues of his new Order of the Temple, which was at this time established in Scotland. According to a contemporary chronicler, David now committed himself to the counsel

⁵⁹ See D. Murray Lyon, *History of the Lodge of Edinburgh*, 2nd ed. (London: Gresham, 1900), 52, 234n.342.

⁶⁰ Alan Macquarrie, *Scotland and the Crusades, 1095–1560* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1985), 10, 14–17.

of religious men of all kinds, and “surrounding himself with very fine brothers of the illustrious knighthood of the Temple of Jerusalem, he made them guardians of his morals by day and by night.”⁶¹ He then established the custom that a Templar would act as almoner to the king’s household. David also welcomed the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, who maintained the Hospital (and became known as Hospitallers), but their early history in Scotland is difficult to trace.

David responded deeply to the ardent spiritualism of Bernard de Clairvaux, the great champion of the crusading movement, and he successfully brought together a multi-ethnic religious and military force in Scotland. Only the pleadings of his people kept him from leaving Scotland to travel to Jerusalem. Even Geoffrey of Monmouth, who despised the Scots and glorified the English legend of Brutus, admired David as a pious and gifted king. In 1136 Geoffrey hinted in his *Historia Regnum Britanniae* that the Scottish king was a descendant of the Biblical David, whose royal image he reflected.⁶² Elaborating on these Jewish roots, Scottish chroniclers would proclaim David I’s descent from Japhet, son of Noah. This potent combination of Hebraic origins and Templar sympathies, embodied in a revered Scottish king, provided the seeds that were later cultivated in the luxuriant Scottish mythologies of eighteenth-century Freemasonry.

Determined to expand the spiritual role of the monastic orders, David initiated a major building program in which many of the great Gothic abbeys and churches were begun. He recruited religious personnel and craftsmen from England and France, who worked at Holyrood, Scone, St. Andrew, Melrose, and other architectural sites that would become the stuff of Masonic legend.⁶³ A surviving mason’s mark at Melrose Abbey features a knight’s shield with compasses, carved by the craftsman and suggestive of a Templar association.⁶⁴ In 1738, when James Anderson (an anti-Jacobite Scot) noted that Scottish Masons “worshipped him [David I] as their beneficent Grand Master,” he revealed an ancient Scottish oral tradition.⁶⁵ Seven

⁶¹ Ibid., 16.

⁶² E. Cowan, “Myth,” 133–34.

⁶³ I.B. Cowan, D.E. Easson, D. Knowles, and R.N. Hadcock, *Medieval Religious Houses: Scotland*, 2nd ed. (London: Longman, 1976), x–xiv.

⁶⁴ Robert S. Mylne, *The Master Masons to the Crown of Scotland and their Works* (Edinburgh: Scot, Ferguson, and Burness, 1893), 7–8.

⁶⁵ James Anderson, *The Constitutions of the Freemasons (1723) and (1738)*. Facs. ed. (Abingdon: Burgess, 1976), 82.

years later, a Masonic lodge at Dundee traced its origins to a lodge established under David I.⁶⁶ This claim—made on 2 May 1745—served the purpose of Jacobites, who were currently utilizing *Écos-sais* lodges to organize a rebellion against England. The Dundee Freemasons further asserted that after David's son, David Earl of Huntingdon, returned from the Holy Wars in 1160, he erected a lodge from which he, as Master, directed the building of the Gothic churches in Dundee.

Anderson hinted at another Scottish tradition when he observed:

Nay, if it were expedient, it could be made to appear, that from this ancient fraternity [masonry], the Societies or Orders of the Warlike Knights, and of the Religious too, in process of time, did borrow many solemn usages.⁶⁷

In a further account of Irish and Scottish masonry, Anderson noted the detailed similarities between the terms of Grand Master, initiations, costumes, regalia, and oaths of secrecy between the crusading orders and the masonic fraternities.⁶⁸ These oral traditions were rooted in real historical developments under the medieval Scottish kings.

The early embodiment in King David I of Templar knightly ideals and Solomonic architectural mysticism foreshadowed an increasing identification of crusading idealism with Scottish independence. One of David I's innovations was the creation of the office of "Royal Steward," who acted as the hereditary manager of the royal household, similar to the "Mayor of the Palace" in Merovingian France.⁶⁹ An early French holder of this office, Charles Martel, would emerge in fifteenth-century masonic documents as an initiate of the mason's craft.⁷⁰ The relevance of the office to Masonic tradition would also become linked with Scottish history, for the office of Royal Steward was the origin of the Stewart/Stuart dynasty.

There is some evidence that Alan, son of Walter the Steward, went on the Third Crusade to recover Jerusalem in 1190.⁷¹ During

⁶⁶ D. Lyon, *History*, 234–35.

⁶⁷ J. Anderson, *Constitutions* (1723), 44.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 196. 1738 ed.

⁶⁹ Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh, *The Temple and the Lodge* (1989; London: Corgi, 1993), 42.

⁷⁰ In the Cooke MS. (ca. 1420).

⁷¹ A. Macquarrie, *Scotland*, 30–31.

this campaign a band of English pilgrims founded in Palestine the Order of St. Thomas of Acre, in honor of the martyred Thomas à Becket. Alan the Steward admired the new order, which modelled itself on the Templars, and he subsequently granted lands to the Knights of St. Thomas in his family's domains at Ayrshire. This early association between the Stewarts and Knights of St. Thomas is provocative, for the order would later have definite links with masonic guilds in London—links which may have been duplicated in Scotland.

Until the last decade of the thirteenth century, Scotland was at peace with England, and Scottish kings patronized the Templars and benefited from the "cosmopolitan and international" nature of the military order.⁷² While most Templars serving in Scotland were of English origin, the native Scottish knights were sent abroad, and evidence survives of their presence in France, Cyprus, and the Holy Land. The continuing links between Scottish Templars and the Middle East reinforced the traditions of Egyptian-Hebraic national origins. However, little is known about the history in Scotland of the Templars' affiliated order, St. Thomas of Acre. Fortunately, there is more evidence in England about the close relationship between the Temple, St. Thomas, and masonry, which was perhaps replicated in the north.

In the 1250's, when the English King Henry III undertook an expensive building program at Westminster Abbey and the Tower of London, he relied heavily on the Templars for financial assistance in the difficult matter of raising money for the construction projects. In 1738, in response to Jacobite claims of Scottish-Templar links in Freemasonry, the anti-Jacobite Anderson would vaguely hint at a connection between Henry's building projects and the Grand Master of the Templars, "a patron of the Freemasons," in London.⁷³ Certainly, Henry III was anxious to maintain profitable relations with the Templars. Thus, in 1269, when the French king Louis IX and the French Preceptors of the Temple urged the English king to support a new crusade, Henry sent his son Prince Edward to join the French expedition.⁷⁴

⁷² Ian Cowan, P.H. Mackay, Alan Macquarrie, eds., *The Knights of St. John of Jerusalem in Scotland*. Scottish History Society, 4th s., IX (1983), xvii–xix.

⁷³ J. Anderson, *Constitutions (1738)*, 69.

⁷⁴ C. Addison, *Knights*, 384–85.

In 1271 Edward travelled to Sicily and Palestine, where he cooperated with the Grand Master of the Templars and succeeded in winning a ten-year peace and safe-passage for pilgrims to Nazareth. When the prince was poisoned, his life was saved by an antidote ministered to him by the Grand Master. In order to finance his return to England, Edward borrowed heavily from Templar bankers in Palestine and Paris.⁷⁵ As King Edward I (reigning 1274–1307), he continued his father's habit of using the Temple as a royal treasury. Since his childhood, Edward had been fascinated by architecture, especially in its military form, and he took advantage of his travels to study the great stone castles built by the Templars in the East. On his return to London, he continued the work begun by his father, Henry III, on Westminster Abbey and the Tower.

During the early years of his reign, Edward I maintained peaceful relations with Scotland and, despite his later aggression, his chivalric and architectural activities won the praise of later Scottish Freemasons. In 1736 at an *Écossais* lodge in Paris, the exiled Jacobite Andrew Michael Ramsay would describe Edward I as a great crusader and Freemason:

After the deplorable mishaps in the Crusades . . . that great Prince Edward, son of Henry III, King of England, seeing there was no longer any safety for his brethren in the Holy Land, whence the Christian troops were retiring, brought them all back and this colony of brothers was established in England. As this prince was endowed with all the high and noble qualities which constitute heroes, he loved the fine arts and in particular, our [Freemasons'] noble science.

Having ascended the Throne, he declared himself Grand Master of the Order, gave it various privileges and rights and from that time, the members of our Fraternity took the name of Freemasons after the example set by their ancestors. Since that time, Great Britain [England, Scotland, and Ireland] became the seat of our Order, the conservator of our laws and the depository of our secrets.⁷⁶

Ramsay's unexpected praise of Edward I, whose later war against Scotland made him anathema to nationalists, was aimed at unifying those English and Scottish Freemasons who currently supported the exiled Stuart king, James "VIII and III." He claimed that he col-

⁷⁵ Eleanor Ferris, "The Financial Relations of the Knights Templars to the English Crown," *American Historical Review*, 8 (1902), 1–17.

⁷⁶ Charles Batham, "Chevalier Ramsay—A New Appreciation," *AQC*, 81 (1968), 303.

lected his historical information from “the annals of Great Britain, in the Acts of Parliament, which often speak of our [Freemasons’] privileges, and in the living traditions of the English people.”

In Edward I’s time one also finds the roots of the “living tradition” that Gothic building projects in the British Isles were associated with the Templars and Jews. During the reigns of Henry III and his son, the crown treasury was severely depleted and inadequate to the demands of royal architectural projects. Thus, both kings ordered their “Keepers of the Works” to not only engage craftsmen but to “extract money from reluctant Jews”—an early hint at the collaboration (though involuntary) between masonic projects and Jewish finance. The precedent had already been set at Lincoln and York, where Jewish masons built fortified stone residences in the former city and where Jewish merchants contributed to the construction of cathedrals in both cities. Since the Templars acted as the major facilitators of such transactions (having charge of the “tallage of London and of the Jews”), it seems certain that the masons in London used their services in raising Jewish funds.⁷⁷ Moreover, the Templars often collaborated with the Jews in international transactions, which included the importation of building stone and craftsmen for royal projects.

Within this context, Heisler’s discovery of a document revealing the participation in Edward’s building program of a knight-mason from Acre becomes provocative. Heisler found a note in Edward I’s accounts for 1278 concerning the employment of “Brother John of the Order of St. Thomas of Acre” as Master of the King’s Works.⁷⁸ At this time, Acre served as a center for Christian and Jewish pilgrims to Palestine, and it gave refuge to hundreds of rabbis from England and France.⁷⁹ While knights of the Temple, Hospital, and St. Thomas constructed great stone citadels and churches, they were assisted by local Jewish artisans. The city also attracted Jewish mystics and scholars, including Abulafia and Nahamides. Heisler suggests that Brother John’s architectural knowledge came from experience in the East, where his order carried out building projects at Tyre

⁷⁷ E. Ferris, “Relations,” 5.

⁷⁸ I am grateful to Ron Heisler for giving me this information, from his unpublished essay, “Crusading Orders and the Early Freemasons.” See also W.J. Williams, “Archbishop Becket and the Masons’ Company of London,” *AQC*, 41 (1928), 130–31, and “Masons of the City of London,” *AQC*, 45 (1932), 127.

⁷⁹ “Acre,” *EJ*.

and Cyprus as well as Acre. An operative mason, who worked with the Keeper of the Works and the master mason, John was given responsibility over the Tower of London, Palace of Westminster, and King's Mews.

At its provincial outposts in England and Scotland, the order continued its imitation of Templar hierarchy and organization. In the process, it became increasingly dependent on the Temple for its financial survival. The relationship was apparently a happy one, and the Templars maintained a chapel dedicated to St. Thomas in their London center. By the time of Brother John's masonic employment, a group of his fellow knights was pressing for full assimilation of the Order of St. Thomas into the Temple.⁸⁰ In 1279 this party, led by the Master, appealed to Edward I for financial support, arguing that the construction of their main church in Acre—begun decades earlier—was still not completed. They also solicited the king's support for union with the Temple, in which they would surrender their property to the older order and assume the Templar habit.

In this same year, the Master also reaffirmed his jurisdiction over the preceptories in Scotland and abroad, so the petition for Templar merger must have been widely disseminated. Though an agreement between the orders was subsequently reached, when the Templars sought to take over the house of St. Thomas in London, a rival party in St. Thomas appealed to Edward to support them against Templar claims. An unknown number of knights transferred their allegiance to the Templars, but the antagonistic party eventually gained the support of the English king, who officially preserved the separate existence of St. Thomas in England. It is unclear whether Brother John, a Master of the King's Works, favored union with the Templars, but he did continue his masonic career in which he worked on fortifications at the Tower in 1292–97. Over the next hundred years, St. Thomas would receive bequests from masonic guilds. In 1389 an operative mason, William Hancock, left a bequest to the "Fraternity of Masons, London, founded at St. Thomas of Acre."⁸¹

The relationship between the orders of the Temple and St. Thomas—and their roots in Palestine—must also be placed within

⁸⁰ A.J. Forey, "The Military Order of St. Thomas of Acre," *English Historical Review*, CCCLXIV (1977), 492–96.

⁸¹ Information from Heisler; see also Douglas Knoop and G.P. Jones, *The Genesis of Freemasonry* (London: Quatuor Coronati Lodge, 1978), 152.

the context of increasing hostility between Scotland and England in the late thirteenth century. When Edward I launched a war against Wales in 1277, it was the first step in his private plan to extend his dominion further into Scotland. In order to subdue and occupy Wales, he determined to encircle the country with English-held castles. Thus, he utilized what he had learned abroad in the development of almost impregnable stone fortifications.⁸² As he subdued Wales, his Master of the Works impressed Welsh masons—under threat of arrest—to not only build the conqueror's castles but to assist the subsequent advance of the English army into Scotland.

In 1284, in order to justify his claim to dominion over Wales and Scotland, Edward “fostered the fiction that he himself was *Arturus redivivus*,” dramatising the claim in a great Round Table in Wales, at which the chivalry of Europe competed and feasted, while the king was presented with the crown of King Arthur.⁸³ He thus initiated a duel of rival national myths, in which the English Brutus and Welsh Arthur were employed to overpower the Scottish Gathelus and Scota. Edward's territorial ambitions were especially ominous for a weakened Scotland, where a disputed succession provoked twelve noblemen—including Robert the Bruce—to mount individual claims to the throne in 1286. At this time, Bruce was on good terms with Edward I and hoped for his support.

Five centuries later, Bruce's claim to the throne would be given a Masonic context, as outlined by Ramsay to his Parisian lodge in 1736:

James Lord Steward of Scotland, was Grand Master of a Lodge established at Kilwinning in the west of Scotland 1286, shortly after the death of Alexander III, King of Scotland, and one year before John Baliol mounted the throne. This lord received as Freemasons into his lodge, the Earls of Gloucester and Ulster, the one English, the other Irish.⁸⁴

Though English historians tend to dismiss Ramsay's assertion, he may have drawn on historical facts. Heisler's argument that the Knights of St. Thomas of Acre worked closely with masonic guilds

⁸² H.M. Colvin, *The History of the King's Works* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1963), I, 232.

⁸³ W. Matthews, “Egyptians,” 293–94.

⁸⁴ C. Batham, “Ramsay,” 303.

is perhaps relevant, given the Stewarts' patronage of the order in the Kilwinning neighborhood of Ayrshire.

In 1291, while the twelve contenders for the Scottish throne pursued their complicated lawsuit, the fate of the orders of the Temple and St. Thomas was imperilled by the Mameluke siege of Acre. Led by the Grand Master of the Templars and assisted by the Knights of St. Thomas, the Christian forces at Acre counted on their "vast and stupendous fortifications" to hold out against the Moslem assault.⁸⁵ Desperate to defend the last Christian citadel in Palestine, the Pope wrote to Edward I, urging him to join a crusade to save Acre. In response, Edward demanded money—"the Holy Land Tenth"—from Scotland in order to finance the expedition. However, he kept the funds for himself, while he assured the Pope that he intended to go to Palestine as soon as he could subdue the troublesome Scots. Despite the stubborn defense mounted by Christians and Jews in Acre, the city fell in May 1291. In the nearby port of Athlit, the capture of the famous Templar castle (Château des Pèlerins) "marked the final end of the Crusades."⁸⁶

While the Mamelukes carried out massacres of Christians and Jews in the conquered cities, the survivors fled to Cyprus, where the Templars established their new capital. Among the refugees was "Robert le Scot," who had been received into the Templar order in the Château in Athlit in 1683, and who now moved from Cyprus to England.⁸⁷ The fall of Acre triggered an international financial crisis, which was compounded in England by Edward I's expulsion of the Jews in 1290.⁸⁸ It is possible that Jewish refugees from Acre as well as England then moved on to Scotland (thus fueling later English charges that "expelled" Jews intermarried with Scots). Enemies of the Templars blamed them for the loss of the Holy Land, and their reputation subsequently declined.

Though Edward I had not contributed to the defense of Acre, he took advantage of the weakened position of the Templars by confiscating their funds in London in late 1291. Arguing that the monies collected for the crusade were no longer needed, he promised to distribute them to the poor—a promise no one, including the

⁸⁵ C. Addison, *Knights*, 391–96.

⁸⁶ "Athlit," *EJ*.

⁸⁷ I. Cowan, *Knights of St. John*, xx.

⁸⁸ C. Addison, *Knights*, 404, 433.

Pope, believed. Under pressure from Rome, he eventually let the funds be transferred to the Templars in Cyprus. Recognizing the straitened conditions of the knights, Edward recruited some of the newly available Templar warriors to his armies. He then turned his full attention to Scotland, where in 1292 he intervened in the Scottish succession dispute and chose John Baliol as king. However, when he insisted that Baliol pay homage to him, the Scottish people were humiliated and launched a resistance movement. When Baliol himself joined the rebellion, Edward marched into Scotland in 1296, stripped the crown from Baliol, and exacted homage from the barons.

In that year he also exacted the "sworn fealty" of Brother John de Sautre, "Master of the Chivalry of the Temple in Scotland."⁸⁹ During the ensuing campaigns, the predominantly English Templars and Hospitallers remained loyal to Edward and served in his army.⁹⁰ In 1298 the leader of the Scottish resistance movement, William Wallace, occupied the Hospitallers' Priory at Torpichen, and at the Battle of Falkirk the Scottish forces killed the English Master of the Templars and Prior of the Hospitallers. It was later asserted that Wallace himself killed the English Templar. These events provide background to the determination of later Scottish monarchs to maintain national control over the Templar-Hospitaller orders in the kingdom.

Determined to discredit Scotland's claim to national independence, Edward seized the public records and tried to destroy "all monuments, histories, and memory of Scotland's ancient past"—an act regarded as cultural genocide by many historians.⁹¹ Even more humiliating to the nationalists, he seized the Stone of Scone and transported it to London. While Scottish bards lamented the theft of the "Stone of Destiny," which had been brought by Gathelus and Scota from Egypt, Wallace roused an angry populace into armed revolt against the English. Edward responded by devastating Scotland, and both sides sent appeals to the Pope in which they argued the justice of their cause.

The Scots claimed not only Egyptian but Jewish ancestors, who were the spiritual and historic founders of their kingdom. Cowan notes that in 1301,

⁸⁹ Ibid., 544.

⁹⁰ I. Cowan, *Knights of St. John*, xxix.

⁹¹ Arthur Williamson, "George Buchanan's Scottish Context," in Roger Mason, ed., *Scotland and England, 1286-1815* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1987), 120.

Scottish envoys at the papal court compared Edward I to Antiochus, defiler of the Temple at Jerusalem in 169 B.C., an action which led to the Maccabean revolt. Edward, they alleged, not only inflicted atrocities upon the Scottish kingdom but “like Antiochus he defiled despotically with sacreligious recklessness [its] church with abominations of numerous kinds.”⁹²

In a bizarre fashion, two fantastic national myths were argued passionately, as the Scots linked recognition of their more ancient “eastern” roots with their right to national survival.⁹³ In 1302 Edward I held a Round Table at the captured Scottish town of Falkirk, where rival “English claims from Brutus and Arthur were symbolized.”⁹⁴

However, Edward did not repeat his Welsh building program in Scotland, and his failure to construct fortified castles was a factor in the English failure to maintain their occupation of Scotland. In Wales Edward and his master masons had been able to impress enough local craftsmen to carry out their projects.⁹⁵ He was unable to similarly recruit Scottish masons, whose long traditions of building in stone were so clearly identified with the beloved King David and Scottish independence. Knoop and Jones stress that there is almost no surviving evidence of the impressment of masons in Scotland, where the system (even under Scottish kings) “operated on a very much smaller scale than in England.”⁹⁶ After Edward passed some months of the winter of 1303 in Dunfermline Abbey, traditional residence of the Scottish kings, he deliberately destroyed all the buildings when his party departed.⁹⁷

It was perhaps the hostile actions of Edward’s large company of military masons that triggered the divergence of Scottish masonry from its English counterpart—a divergence that continued until the unification of the crowns under the Stuart kings in the seventeenth century. When Edward returned to England, leaving behind an occupying force, a defiant section of the Scottish clergy now added cru-

⁹² Edward J. Cowan, “Identity, Freedom and the Declaration of Arbroath,” in Dauvit Broun, R.J. Finlay, and Michael Lynch, eds., *Image and Identity: The Making and Re-making of Scotland Through the Ages* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1998), 42.

⁹³ Roger Mason, “Scotching the Brut: Politics, History, and National Myth in Sixteenth-Century Scotland,” in R. Mason, *Scotland and England*, 62–63.

⁹⁴ W. Matthews, “Egyptians,” 297.

⁹⁵ H. Colvin, *History*, I, 232–33, 412–22.

⁹⁶ D. Knoop and G. Jones, *Genesis*, 34–35.

⁹⁷ David Macgibbon and Thomas Ross, *The Castellated and Domestic Architecture of Scotland* (Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1887), I, 514–15.

sader propaganda to their Egyptian claims. In pulpits across Scotland, they exhorted the sons of Scota that their war against the English king "was more justified than fighting against the Saracens."⁹⁸ This re-direction of crusader hostility from the Moslem infidel to the English invader provides a provocative context for the shadowy tradition of a Templar contribution to Scottish resistance, during the reign of Edward I's successor.

In 1305, after the rebel leader Wallace was captured and executed, Robert Bruce abandoned his allegiance to Edward I and revived the war against England. Supported by Bishop Lamberton of St. Andrews, who defined Bruce's crusade as a holy war, Bruce hoped to restore an independent Celtic kingdom. In 1306 Bruce carried out a strange ritualistic killing of the English puppet king Comyn at the altar of a church in Dumfries. The murder led to the excommunication of Bruce by the Pope, but Bishop Lamberton defiantly crowned him king of Scotland in the abbey church at Scone. To counter this move, Edward I stressed the illegitimacy of Bruce's claim by ordering a special coronation throne to be built with the Stone of Scone fitted under it. From 1307 on, the kings of England were crowned upon the captured stone—as an emblem of England's claim to dominion over Scotland.

After Edward I's death that year, balladeers in London boasted of his military conquest and theft of "the Stone of Destiny." They also repeated and mocked the Scottish envoys' claim about its origin:

In Egypt Moses preached to the people. Scota, Pharaoh's daughter, listened well, for he said in the spirit, "Whoso will possess this stone, shall be the conqueror of a very far-off land." Gaidelon and Scota brought this stone, when they passed from the land of Egypt to Scotland . . .⁹⁹

The linking of the stone with Moses's prophetic trance state ("he said in the spirit") revealed accretions to the myth which stressed the Scots' claim to visionary expertise. Moreover, when Jacob slept on the Stone, he was granted a vision of an angel-filled ladder linking heaven and earth.

In the meantime on the Continent, Philip the Fair had launched his persecution of the Templars. In 1307 Philip wrote to his son-

⁹⁸ A. Macquarrie, *Scotland and Crusades*, 71.

⁹⁹ M. Dominica Legge, "La Piere d'Escose," *SHR*, 38 (1959), 109–13.

in-law Edward II, newly crowned king of England, urging him to arrest and interrogate the Templars in the British Isles. However, Edward was reluctant to proceed and wrote back that the charges of hideous crimes and blasphemies seemed incredible. When the Pope sent an official Bull against the Templars, the king was forced to act, but he was deliberately dilatory in implementing the arrests and investigations. One catch was Robert le Scot, but his compatriot Thomas Scot and many other knights managed to escape. To their disappointment, the English inquisitors found few arms or treasures left in the Templars' residences.

In Scotland the Pope ordered Bishop Lamberton to carry out the investigation—at the same time that Lamberton was supporting Bruce's crusade. The main charge in Scotland, especially from lay witnesses, was the secrecy of Templar proceedings. Under interrogation, the Preceptor of Scotland, Brother Walter of Clifton, admitted that suspicions about the order arose mainly because of the secret receptions of their members.¹⁰⁰ He also revealed that news of impending arrest had led to the flight of many knights, whose whereabouts were now unknown. Another brother admitted that the Templars had been avaricious in their attempts to gain more land in Scotland. Though wierd stories of black magic, sexual perversion, and "Saracenic" heresies were extracted from a few witnesses, the inquisitors gleaned little information and less support for their persecution. Moreover, the Scottish Templars were never subjected to harsh treatment or torture.¹⁰¹ At the same time in England, a reluctant Edward II finally gave orders to use torture, which elicited the revelation from one knight that his colleagues had escaped to Scotland.

While the trials of Templars dragged on throughout Europe, the inquisitors in England finally got a break in 1311 when a fugitive Templar, Stephen de Stapelbrugge, was captured and confessed to heretical practices. He revealed that during his induction he was instructed to deny that Jesus was God and man and that Mary was his mother. He was then ordered to spit on the cross. Stephen further claimed that the order's errors had originated in the Agen area of France—center of the heretical Cathars. His confession was soon followed by that of John de Stoke, treasurer of the Temple in London,

¹⁰⁰ Charles Perkins, "The Knights Templars in the British Isles," *English Historical Review*, 25 (1910), 227.

¹⁰¹ C. Addison, *Knights*, 263, 434–36, 544.

who alleged that the Grand Master, Jacques de Molay, had enjoined him to believe in "the great omnipotent God, who created heaven and earth, and not in the Crucifixion."¹⁰² More knights confessed to similar heresies, thus admitting in effect that the order had assimilated Jewish and Moslem beliefs during their long sojourn in the Middle East and southern Europe.

According to the pseudo-Lullian treatises, Ramon Lull was also arrested in England in 1311—perhaps on similar charges.¹⁰³ Yates points out that Lull assimilated Cathar notions, as well as Cabalistic and Moslem lore, into his *Ars Magna*—with the aim of converting all three "heretical" groups.¹⁰⁴ If Lull really did contact King Robert or his agents, then he may have been arrested by Edward II for collaboration with the Scots. In the meantime, the convicted Templars in London were ordered to do penance and were then reconciled with the church. In England and Scotland no burnings of the "heretics" occurred, and officials ignored reports of wandering knights who refused to give up their distinctive red-cross habits. When the Pope ordered the dissolution of the order in 1312, its properties and remaining personnel were transferred to the Knights Hospitaller. It is possible that some of the fugitive knights had already found refuge in the Order of St. Thomas of Acre, which continued for the next hundred years to have a special relationship with masonic guilds. After Jacques de Molay was burned at the stake in Paris in 1314, many Templars defied the Pope and found sympathetic support among other orders in Germany, Portugal, and Spain. And, according to Masonic tradition, they continued a clandestine existence in Scotland.

It was perhaps Bishop Lamberton who decided that the fugitive Templars could be of service to Bruce in the continuing struggle with England. Later Scottish Freemasons would claim that Bruce took advantage of the arrival in Scotland of a band of mounted Templars, who trained the Scots in Saracenic military tactics.¹⁰⁵ The Templars allegedly provided a hidden reserve force, whose sudden

¹⁰² Richard Barber, *The Knight and Chivalry*, 2nd ed. (Ipswich: Boydell, 1974), 202.

¹⁰³ M. Pereira, *Alchemical Corpus*, 39–40.

¹⁰⁴ F. Yates, "Ramon Lull," 37–38.

¹⁰⁵ Claude Thory, *Acta Latamorum, ou chronologie de l'histoire de la Franche-Maçonnerie* (Paris: Pierre-Elie Dufart, 1815), see "Bruce"; M. Baigent and R. Leigh, *Temple*, 58–65; Archie McKercher, "Bruce's Secret Weapon," *The Scots Magazine*, n.s., 135 (1991), 261–68.

appearance at the battle of Bannockburn in 1314 sent panic into the English forces. Bruce kept the Templar identification secret, because he was trying to regain the support of the Pope and Philip the Fair for Scotland's struggle against England. According to Jacobite Masonic documents from the 1740's, Bruce celebrated the victory and rewarded the knights by establishing the "Royal Order of Scotland." The anti-Jacobite historian Murray Lyon, who examined the documents in Edinburgh, reported:

The Royal Order is composed of two Degrees, viz., that of "Heredom of Kilwinning," alleged to have originated in the reign of David I., King of Scotland, and the "Rosy Cross," affirmed to have been instituted by Robert the Bruce, which monarch is also represented as having in 1314 revived the former and incorporated it with the latter under the title of The Royal Order of Scotland. The ritual of this Rite embraces what may be termed a spiritualization of the supposed symbols and ceremonies of the Christian architects and builders of primitive times, and so closely associates the sword with the trowel as to lead to the Second Degree being denominated an Order of Masonic Knighthood, which its recipients are asked to believe was first conferred on the field of Bannockburn, as a reward for the valour that had been displayed by a body of Templars who aided Bruce in that memorable victory; and that afterwards a Grand Lodge was established by the King at Kilwinning, with reservation of the office of Grand Master to him and his successors on the Scottish throne.¹⁰⁶

Though Lyon dismisses this account as the "purely fabulous" concoction of the Jacobite intriguer Ramsay, the latter drew on seeds of historical fact which he cultivated into a flourishing tree of Masonic legend.

Before Bannockburn Bruce had been ordered by the Pope to sequester all Templar properties and turn them over to the Hospitallers. However, he did little about the transference. Sire argues that the Hospitallers unmistakably served as "an arm of the Anglo-Norman ascendancy"—a role which would make them undeserving of such rich spoils in Bruce's eyes.¹⁰⁷ Thus, he took steps to ensure the future loyalty of the Hospitallers in Scotland, who had earlier obeyed the English Prior and served in Edward's army. In 1314 Bruce's ally Sir Ralph Lindsay took possession of Torpichen and asserted the inde-

¹⁰⁶ D. Murray Lyon, "The Royal Order of Scotland," *The Freemason* (4 September 1880), 393.

¹⁰⁷ H.J.A. Sire, *The Knights of Malta* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1994), 180–81.

pendence of the Scottish branch of the order. The Bruce dynasty allegedly allowed the continued secret existence of its Templar supporters, who were not eliminated but rather combined with the Hospitallers. In the eighteenth century, Jacobite initiates of the Clermont rite (which drew on Ramsay's history) were told that in 1316 Petrus von Bononien, the last Prior of the Parisian chapter of Templars, escaped to Scotland, where he revealed the Hermetic secrets of the Temple to selected "masters" in the masonic fraternity.¹⁰⁸

In their popular history, *The Temple and the Lodge*, Baigent and Leigh argue that the surviving Templars contributed their traditions of architectural design and masonic symbolism to the working stonemasons in Scotland. Citing the appearance of Templar and masonic emblems (straight sword, crossed legs, compass, square, etc.) on fourteenth and fifteenth century gravestones, they note the similarity to surviving emblems on the Templar castle at Athlit.¹⁰⁹ Could Robert le Scot, a Templar from Athlit, have contributed his knowledge of these designs?¹¹⁰ For Bruce to take advantage of the building skills of the Knights of the Temple (and St. Thomas of Acre) would have been a logical and pragmatic policy, for they were renowned for their expertise in designing and constructing strong stone fortifications. Moreover, he was determined that the craft skills of the English masons and engineers would not be used against him again. Bruce thus ordered the systematic destruction of all the stone fortresses on the borders, "in order that English should never again be able to lord it over the land by holding the castles."¹¹¹ According to eighteenth-century documents, Bruce's "Royal Order and the Masonic Fraternity at Kilwinning were governed by the same head."¹¹²

Bruce's victories, perhaps assisted by the Templars, roused new enthusiasm for Scotland's Egyptian-Hebraic traditions. In 1320 a contingent of Scottish nobles sent to the Pope a stirring manifesto of Scottish independence, known as the "Declaration of Arbroath." Citing "ancient acts and records," they recounted the Scots' migration from Scythia, Egypt, and Spain:

¹⁰⁸ Werner G. Zimmerman, *Von den alten zur neuen Freimaurerei: Briefwechsel und Logenreden von Diethelm Lawater nach 1800* (Zurich: Modestia cum Liberate, 1994), 172, 268.

¹⁰⁹ M. Baigent and R. Leigh, *Temple*, 22-34.

¹¹⁰ C. Addison, *Knights*, 433.

¹¹¹ H. Colvin, *History*, I, 419-20.

¹¹² D. Lyon, "Royal Order," 393.

And having removed from these parts, above 1,200 years after the coming of the Israelites out of Egypt, did by many victories and much toil obtain these parts in the West which they still possess . . . [and] have always retained free from all manner of servitude and subjection . . .

This kingdom hath been governed by an uninterrupted succession of 113 kings, all of our own native and royal stock, without the intervening of any stranger.¹¹³

While praising their Mosaic deliverer Robert Bruce, the nobles also made clear that he served as king only with “the due and lawful consent and assent of all the people,” who could depose him if he violated Scotland’s ancient laws and customs:

To him we are obliged and resolved in all things, both upon the account of his right and his own merit, as being the person who hath restored the people’s safety in defence of their liberties. But after all, if this prince shall leave those principles he hath so nobly pursued, and consent that we or our kingdom be subjected to the king or people of England, we shall immediately endeavour to expel him, as our enemy and subverter both of his own and our rights, and we will make another king, who will defend our liberties: For so long as there shall be but one hundred of us remain alive we will never consent to subject ourselves to the dominion of the English. For it is not glory, it is not riches, neither is it honours, but it is liberty alone that we fight and contend for, which no honest man will lose but with his life.

The political implications of this stirring declaration, which made clear the delicate balance between independent nobles and patriot king, would emerge in turbulent power struggles over the next centuries. But, even more resonant for future developments was the repeated identification of Scottish nationalists with the ancient Jews. Bruce was first identified with Joshua, who led the Israelites across the Jordan and destroyed the fortified city of Jericho. Like Joshua, who laid a curse upon anyone who tried to rebuild Jericho, Bruce vowed that the English would never rebuild the border castles. Did Bruce also imitate Joshua by engraving the sacred laws upon “an altar of whole stones, over which no man hath lift up any iron”?¹¹⁴ The prohibition against metal tools in the sacred building projects of the Jews would be expanded in Hebrew Temple traditions and, later, in the rituals of Scots-Irish Freemasonry. Swift affirmed that

¹¹³ Declaration reprinted in Gordon Donaldson, ed., *Scottish Historical Documents* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1970), 55–58.

¹¹⁴ *Joshua* 9: 30–35.

Joshua “took a great Stone and put it up under the Oak, emblematically joyning the Two great Elements of Masonry to raise an Altar for the LORD.”¹¹⁵ William Auld, an Edinburgh Freemason, drew on ancient Scottish tradition when he portrayed Joshua as a Masonic hero who fixed the Tabernacle at Shiloh.¹¹⁶

Thus, the Arbroath nobles’ second identification of Bruce with Judas Maccabeus becomes especially provocative. In *I Maccabees*, the father of Judas Maccabeus gives a deathbed speech in which he exhorts the Jews to “be zealous for the law, and give your lives for the covenant of your fathers,” despite the fact that “Arrogance now stands secure and gives judgment against us.”¹¹⁷ As first asserted by Scottish nationalists in 1301, Antiochus’s deliberate destruction of Jewish religious scrolls, including all the Books of the Covenant, provided striking parallels to Edward I’s acts of cultural genocide against the Scots. When Antiochus also tried to force the Jews to eat “swine’s flesh,” the Maccabean brothers refused and were martyred. The anthropologist Fabre-Vassas observes that in this Hebrew-Maccabean “founding story, refusing to eat pork in the face of those who have come from outside to subjugate the Jews is to affirm that identity, to perform an act of allegiance and fidelity to the ancestral laws.”¹¹⁸ Similarly, in the Declaration of Arbroath, the Scots asserted that the foreign invaders forced them to live like beasts in the mountains, feeding on wild herbs “in the manner of the Maccabees.”¹¹⁹ Thus, it was probably during this period that the Scots proudly adopted the Jewish taboo against pork, which they would maintain over the next centuries—much to the scorn and amusement of their English enemies.

However, the second great theme of *I Maccabees* is the role that Judas Maccabeus played in the purification and restoration of the Temple:

¹¹⁵ J. Swift, *Prose*, V, 330.

¹¹⁶ [William Auld], *The Free-Mason’s Pocket Companion* (Edinburgh: Ruddiman, Auld, 1761), 14.

¹¹⁷ John Bartlett, ed., *The First and Second Book of Maccabees* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1973), 62–63.

¹¹⁸ Claudine Fabre-Vassas, *The Singular Beast: Jews, Christians, & the Pig*, trans. Carol Volk (New York: Columbia UP, 1997), 6. I am grateful to A.S. Byatt for sending me this illuminating book. Also, see A. Williamson, “Pil,” 237–58.

¹¹⁹ G.W. Barrow, “The Idea of Freedom in Late Medieval Scotland,” *Innes Review*, 30 (1979), 30.

Judas and his brothers said: "Now that our enemies have been crushed, let us go up to Jerusalem to cleanse the temple and rededicate it." So the whole army assembled and went up to Mount Zion. There they found the temple laid waste . . .

Then Judas detailed troops to engage the garrison of the citadel while he cleansed the temple. He selected priests without blemish, devoted to the law, and they purified the temple, removing to an unclean place the stones that defiled it. They discussed what to do with the altar of burnt offering, which was profaned, and rightly decided to demolish it . . . They therefore pulled down the altar, and stored away the stones in a fitting place on a temple hill, until a prophet should arise who could be consulted about them. They took unhewn stones, as the law commands, and built a new altar on the model of the previous one. They rebuilt the temple and retored its interior . . .¹²¹

If a contingent of Templars really did help Bruce, then this identification of the Scottish king with Judas Maccabeus would have been particularly significant. As Nicholson demonstrates, the Templars had long been compared to the Maccabees who fought to preserve a covenanted land and sacred temple.¹²¹ Moreover, Bruce's partisans at Arbroath possibly responded to a surviving Templar desire to regain the lost city of Jerusalem. Thus, they appealed to the Pope to support their cause against England in order to free them to carry out a new crusade:

It is your concernment, Most Holy Father, to interpose in this [dispute], when you see how far the violence and barbarity of the pagans [Moslems] is let loose to rage against Christendom for punishing of the sins of the Christians, and how much they daily encroach upon the Christian territories . . . Let it therefore please your Your Holiness to exhort the Christian princes not to make the wars betwixt them and their neighbors a pretext for not going to the relief of the Holy Land, since that is not the true cause of the impediment . . . And God (who is ignorant of nothing) knows with how much cheerfulness both our king and we would go thither, if the king of England would leave us in peace . . .¹²²

In an unusual statement, the nobles also addressed the Pope as the protector of universal religion, describing him as earthly Vicar of the God who makes "no respect nor distinction of Jew nor Greek, Scot

¹²⁰ J. Bartlett, *Maccabees*, 62–63.

¹²¹ Helen Nicholson, *Templars, Hospitallers, and Teutonic Knights* (Leicester: Leicester UP, 1993), 15, 140n.1.

¹²² G. Donaldson, *Scottish Historical*, 57–58.

nor English," but looks upon all with "a tender and fatherly eye." Urging the Pope to "suffer us to live at peace in that narrow spot of Scotland, beyond which we have no habitation," they assured him that "we desire nothing but our own." This appeal, which merges patriotism with universalism, foreshadows the tradition in *Écossais* Freemasonry which was affirmed by the Scottish exile Ramsay in 1736:

Patriotism badly understood and pushed to excess by men who inhabited a small portion of the Universe, destroyed in all these warrior republics the love of humanity in general . . . The whole world is nothing but a huge republic, of which each nation is a family and each individual a child.¹²³

For Ramsay, chivalric Freemasonry—originated by the Jews, transmitted by the knights of the Temple, and preserved in Scotland—combined the best of patriotism and internationalism. Thus, it is relevant that several of the signers of the Declaration of Arbroath—Alexander Seton, Gilbert Hay, and Henry St. Clair—came from families associated earlier with crusaders and later with Freemasonry.

To further emphasize Scotland's historic roots in and current ties to the Holy Land, the nobles reminded the Pope that St. Andrew, the Jewish fisherman who had been martyred in Scythia, was made the patron saint of Scotland by express command of Jesus. To renew those historic ties, Bruce attended a conference in 1323 in York, where he repeated his demand for the restoration of the Stone of Scone which had earlier stimulated visions in the prophet Jacob and accompanied Scota from Egypt. Bruce's own determination to make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem was prevented, because his presence was too important in Scotland.¹²⁴ At his death in 1329, Bruce's instruction that his heart be carried to Palestine was undertaken by Sir James Douglas and a party of knights. However, when they joined the crusade of King Alonzo XI in Spain, all but one were killed. The lone survivor, Sir William Keith, brought Bruce's heart back to Scotland, where it was buried in Melrose Abbey. According to popular tradition, Bruce's body was buried in a Templar fashion, with

¹²³ C. Batham, "Ramsay," 298.

¹²⁴ On the patriotic tradition of Bruce as "internationalist" chivalric hero, see Carol Edington, "Paragons and Patriots: National Identity and the Chivalric Ideal in Late-Medieval Scotland," in D. Broun, *Image and Identity*, 69–81.

his leg-bones crossed under his skull.¹²⁵ A neighbor in the Melrose tombs was Michael Scot, who had earlier been welcomed by the Templars in Jerusalem. Around both men, romantic and occult legends would accumulate over the years.

Though Edward III was forced to recognize Bruce as king of an independent Scotland in 1328, Bruce's son and successor David II was unable to maintain the hard-won sovereignty. English armies crossed the border again in 1333, and Edward III implemented the earlier Welsh policy of building castles for English occupation. Edward employed an official called "the King's Free-Mason," one of the earliest known uses of the term.¹²⁶ He ordered the impressment of English masons in Norfolk and Suffolk to work on Dunnottar Castle near Aberdeen, and he granted a master mason from Yorkshire the power to impress Scottish masons to work under English supervisors on Edinburgh castle.¹²⁷ These actions must have roused hostility among the Scottish masons, for a policy of impressment was rarely—if ever—used in their kingdom. Over the next decade, despite Edward's construction of stone fortresses, the English never gained control of the countryside and, by 1341, they had been driven out of the castles. The English military masons withdrew, and the Scottish nationalists regained control of their local guilds.

Parallel with the impressment of Scottish masons was the English effort to confiscate the wealth of the Scottish Templars and to regain control of the Scottish Hospitallers.¹²⁸ In 1338, when the English Prior (under orders from Edward III) launched an investigation of the revenues of the Scottish Templars and their Hospitaller heirs, he was disappointed to find no funds for collection. Though the devastation carried out by English forces may account for the lack of revenue, it seems more likely that funds were hidden from the invaders—probably with the help of the Scottish royal family. By 1345 the guardian of "the house of St. John of Jerusalem at Torpichen" was Alexander Seton, whose family was connected "by ties of family and of patriotism with the cause of Bruce." Despite the dearth of documents from the period, two charters survive that reveal the

¹²⁵ M. Baigent and R. Leigh, *Temple*, 68–69, 364n.18.

¹²⁶ J. Anderson, *Constitutions* (1723), 31.

¹²⁷ H. Colvin, *History*, I, 420–22; Douglas Knoop and G.P. Jones, *The Scottish Mason and the Mason Word* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1939), 48–50.

¹²⁸ Jonathan Edwards, "The Hospitallers in Scotland in the Fifteenth Century," *SHR*, 9 (1912), 54–62.

continuing existence of "Temple Courts" witnessed by Seton.¹²⁹ According to later Scottish chronicles, Seton's ancestors had participated in Templar crusades and at least one descendant made a peaceful pilgrimage for the Hospitallers to Jerusalem.¹³⁰ In the eighteenth century, Jacobite Freemasons would claim that the Setons served as hereditary guardians of the secret Order of the Temple in Scotland, which continued a clandestine existence with the connivance of the Scottish kings.¹³¹

Though David II was devoted to the ideals of chivalry and hoped to lead a Scottish contingent of crusaders, the English invasion of France in 1336 forced the diversion of Franco-Scottish crusading forces from the Moslems toward the English. The subsequent English effort to regain control over Templar properties and Hospitaller acquisitions thus took place within the context of the developing Hundred Years' War, which was antithetical to all crusading ideals. However, the vacuum created by the dissolution of the Templars in England and France was filled by creating neo-Templar orders which were supposed to rally knightly support for the rival kings' war policies. In 1346 the English captured David II and held him for nine years, during which he observed the attempts of Edward III to develop his own knightly order and to suppress the organizations of disaffected craftsmen. Both these developments contributed to the divergent history of Scottish chivalry and masonry.

The long war with France and continuing border struggles with Scotland created enormous economic problems in England, which were compounded by the "Black Death" plague. In 1348 Edward III determined to strengthen martial valour by creating a new chivalric order called the Garter.¹³² At the same time, he attempted to revive the Round Table of King Arthur, which made the Scots view both initiatives as vehicles of English imperialism. Despite later romantic legends about the imagery of the Garter (that it was dropped by a beautiful lady), Edward actually took it from the warrior knight's accoutrement and used it to celebrate his victory over the French at Calais. The founding knights were drawn from Edward's English

¹²⁹ I. Cowan, *Knights of St. John*, 51–53; M. Baigent and R. Leigh, *Temple*, 97, 369n.9.

¹³⁰ A. Macquarrie, *Scotland*, 80–93.

¹³¹ M. Baigent and R. Leigh, *Temple*, 97, 226–34, 268.

¹³² Grace Holmes, *The Order of the Garter* (Windsor: Oxley, 1984), 4–13.

and Gascon subjects, but the king planned to recruit foreign knights who would be bound to him in future wars “in a firm band of Friendship and Honor.” Probably in retaliation, the French king in 1352 created the Order of the Star, an almost identical fraternity, but four years later its entire membership was annihilated by English forces at Poitiers.

At the same time, Edward III determined to impose control over the rebellious stonemasons, who went on strike at the royal building sites of Windsor and Westminster in 1348.¹³³ Because of depopulation from the plague and the constant need for new military recruits, Edward had implemented a severe policy of impressment, with imprisonment for resistance, to gather enough builders for his lavish projects. In 1349 he issued an ordinance which froze all artisans’ wages, despite a huge rise in prices, and he singled out the “master freestone mason” and “other masons” for tight regulation. There was much resistance to this intrusion on their craft, and by 1356 the king issued specific regulations for “the Trade of Masons.” Four years later, stronger penalties were imposed, including the burning of the letter “F” on the forehead of fugitive artisans. The building fraternities were notified that “all alliances and covines of masons and carpenters, and congregations, chapters, ordinances, and oaths betwixt them made, or to be made, shall be from henceforth void and wholly annulled.”

Meanwhile in Scotland, the Knights Hospitallers and stonemasons maintained their loyalty to their native kings and continued their role as patriotic defenders of the realm. The divergent paths taken by the Scottish chivalric orders and masonic fraternities were probably influenced by the experiences of David II, during his captivity in an England torn by civil unrest. Though Edward III managed to utilize the Garter effectively within England, he had less success in recruiting foreign princes to its oaths of loyalty. The Founder’s Statute ordained that the knights should not serve against the sovereign or each other; thus, as Holmes notes, “independent princes hesitated to accept and looked with suspicion on their subjects as did.”¹³⁴ Edward’s creation was also rendered largely ceremonial by 1360, when a temporary peace between the warring Christian kings was achieved.

¹³³ R. Gould, *History*, I, 327–47.

¹³⁴ G. Holmes, *Garter*, 13.

In Cyprus the crusading orders hoped to take advantage of the peace to revive the plans for an expedition against the real “infidels.” The knights had an eloquent new spokesman in King Peter I (de Lusignan) of Cyprus, who travelled to London in 1363 in order to rouse support for a new crusade. Calling himself king of Jerusalem, Peter urged Edward III to support his effort to regain Palestine. Though Edward was not interested, the Scottish king was. After promising to pay a large ransom, David II had been released from prison. To express his gratitude to God, the deeply pious David was currently making a pilgrimage to a shrine in Norfolk, where he learned of Peter’s presence in London. He hastened to the city, where Peter rejoiced at David’s enthusiasm for the cause, and both men joined Edward at dinners in Westminster. David determined to become a leader in Peter’s crusade, and he recruited many Scotsmen to follow him. Though the financial demands of David’s ransom prevented his journey, a contingent of Scottish knights did join Peter’s enterprise.

It was perhaps David II’s willingness to expend money and blood for the crusade that alerted Edward III to the continuing close relationship of the Hospitallers with the Scottish royal family. The famous preceptory at Torpichen had been leased to David de Mar, secretary of David’s first wife. In 1371 a new king, Robert II, assumed the throne and determined to revive the policies of his grandfather Robert Bruce. Robert II’s family had served as Stewards of Scotland, and his accession initiated the Stewart dynasty that would survive until 1688. The king soon launched a Stewart tradition of support for the independence of the local Hospitallers against English counter-claims.

In 1374 Torpichen was headed by a layman, who gained papal recognition of the order’s status as an independent Scottish order. This act so angered Edward III that he and the London chapter threatened to cut off their support of the Pope’s current crusade. The Pope then withdrew his recognition of Scotland, but Edward nevertheless sequestrated all the property of the order in England.¹³⁵ He wrote to the Grand Master, now based on Rhodes, that he would keep the properties until he (the Master) granted London power over all appointments to Scotland. Rather than comply with this order,

¹³⁵ J. Edwards, “Hospitallers,” 54–55; H. Sire, *Knights*, 185.

the Hospitallers in Scotland either disbanded or went underground. The patriotic identification of the crusading orders with Scottish nationalism was then given eloquent expression in John Barbour's poetic romance, *The Bruce* (1375). Barbour, archdeacon of Aberdeen, portrayed Bruce as a chivalric hero who wanted to end his days in Jerusalem. Like the nobles at Arbroath, Barbour identified the patriotic Scots with the Jewish Maccabees. Thus, Bruce's "simple folk and worthy" were:

... like to the Maccabees,
That, as men in the bible says,
Through their great worship and valour,
Fought in-to many stalwart stour [battle]
For to deliver their country
From folk that, through iniquity,
Held them and their's in vassalage . . .¹³⁶

As we shall see, the perception of "covenanted" Maccabees and Scots as patriotic warriors and restorers of the Temple would prove attractive to working stonemasons by 1456. Barbour also hinted at Jewish-Scottish traditions of "second sight," which became part of Scottish masonic tradition. Though he was sceptical of the accuracy of most astrological and necromantic predictions, Barbour affirmed that David and the Hebrew prophets could foretell things by inspiration:

As David was, and Jeromy,
Samuel, Joel, and Isaiah,
That through his holy grace can tell
Full things that afterward befell.¹³⁷

That the Scots, not the English, had access to this prophetic gift was suggested by Barbour's gloating that Edward II was misled by a sooth-sayer into believing he would be buried at Jerusalem, whereas he ended up dead at "Burgh-in-the-Sand." Instead, it was Bruce who made arrangements for his own heart to be carried to Jerusalem. Though that journey was aborted, at least the heart participated in a crusade against the Saracens.

In Barbour's romance, the association of Scottish nationalism with Jewish patriotism, crusader idealism, and prophetic vision, suggests

¹³⁶ John Barbour, *The Bruce*, ed. Walter W. Skeat (Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1894), I, 20. I have modernized the spelling.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, I, 106.

the imaginative context that led to the development of Freemasonry. The gift or technique of achieving clairvoyant visions would later provoke curiosity and alarm about the masons. In 1638 a Scottish poet would publicly boast: "We have the Mason Word, and second sight,/Things for to come we can foretell aright."¹³⁸ Knoop argues that the Mason Word originally drew on Jewish traditions of the tetragrammaton, the ineffable name of God, which was never to be spoken and which the masons expressed by a manual or bodily sign.¹³⁹ Swift would later hint that the "Master Secret" of the Masons' "Great Word" involved postures and grips imitating certain Hebrew letters.¹⁴⁰ The masons' claim to "second sight" was probably rooted in Cabalistic visualization techniques that were transmitted from the East and southern Europe. Moreover, this "Lullist" art was taught to some Hospitallers.

Unfortunately, no records of the Scottish Hospitallers survive from the period of the Great Schism in the Papacy. While Scotland and her ally France adhered to the "anti-Pope," Clement VII, England favored the authoritarian Urban VI. After the restoration of papal unity, the Scottish Hospitallers resurfaced and reaffirmed their independence, while they tied the order even more firmly to the crown. In the 1380's the Scottish preceptories were leased to royalist office holders, thus strengthening the Davidian heritage. As part of the Stewart revival of these traditions, John of Fordun wrote his *Scotichronicon* (ca. 1385), in which he reported that David Earl of Huntingdon, son of David I, fought with the knightly orders in the Third Crusade.¹⁴¹ Though the story was probably apocryphal, it placed another "Hebraic" David with a Stewart in that crusade. Later propagandists for Franco-Scottish collaboration against England would revive and embellish these claims.

As Fordun recounted the story of Scotland's Egyptian-Mosaic origins, he added eloquent testimony of those national traits which distinguished the Scots from their "brutish" neighbors:

... the devotion to justice that led Gathelus to teach his people the laws of Greece, the simple piety of Scots even when they were pagans, the love of freedom that led them to reject obedience to a strange

¹³⁸ H. Adamson, *Muses Threnodie*, 32.

¹³⁹ D. Knoop and G. Jones, *Scottish Mason*, 100.

¹⁴⁰ J. Swift, *Prose*, V, 325-26.

¹⁴¹ A. Macquarrie, *Scotland*, 30-31.

king in favor of a life of barefoot independence, the peace and charity they ever displayed towards any neighbor who would reciprocate.¹⁴²

These moral and patriotic traits were linked to mystical and occult powers, as Fordun emphasized the magical powers of the Stone of Scone, which he called the “Stone of Knowledge.” Drawing on ancient Irish sagas and early patristic literature, Fordun added to them materials from Jewish and Arabic sources—such as Josephus, the *Picatrix*, and treatises on sympathetic and astral magic.¹⁴³

As part of his nationalistic campaign, Robert II launched an extensive building program which gradually turned Scottish architecture away from developments south of the border. Fawcett observes that the period from 1371 to 1424 was “the most seminally creative in the history of Scottish Gothic architecture.”¹⁴⁴ While English forces occupied much of France, Scotland strengthened her ties with France and paid for it by suffering periodic English attacks. The hostilities severely tested the traditional mobility of masons, who were allowed to cross national borders in order to work on major building projects. Thus, though an English mason was licensed to travel to Scotland to work on the tomb of David II in 1372, the Scottish king and church focused increasingly on local masonic guilds and Continental inspiration for their architectural projects. At St. Andrews, Robert paid two Scottish masons, who worked with a French mason, to rebuild the cathedral, in what Fawcett calls a “rather un-English” style.

In 1385 a large French force arrived in Scotland, and it included military masons charged with countering the English fortification efforts. Unlike England, France had readmitted the Jews and scholarly contacts had been resumed between the religious communities. Moreover, a wave of persecution in some parts of Spain in 1391 sent many Jews to France, where they infused their mixed Judeo-Arabic traditions into French artisan and intellectual life.¹⁴⁵ As noted earlier, Jewish stonemasons had earlier contributed their expertise to buildings in northern France. In other parts of Spain, especially

¹⁴² W. Matthews, “Egyptians,” 297.

¹⁴³ Walter Bower, *Scotichronicon*, ed. D.E.R. Watt (Aberdeen: Aberdeen UP, 1987), I, xxvii–xxii.

¹⁴⁴ See Richard Fawcett, *Scottish Architecture: From the Accession of the Stewarts to the Reformation, 1371–1560* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1994), xvii–xxi, 24, 29, 35, 41.

¹⁴⁵ M. Wischnitzer, *History*, 108, 118–19.

Castile, there was continuing cooperation between Jewish and Christian guilds well into the fifteenth-century. This was also a period when Jewish artisans gained access to the mystical-visualization traditions of the *Sepher Yetzirah* and *Zohar*, which allegedly influenced their craft “mystery.”

When Robert III assumed the Scottish throne in 1390, he continued to patronise masonic projects, which included revived building activities by the Knights Hospitallers, who were aided by their French brothers.¹⁴⁶ The king sympathized with the crusading ideals of the Hospitallers, and he possibly became privy to their inherited Templar traditions of architecture. The Grand Prior, Henry of Lychton, collaborated with his relative, the Bishop of Aberdeen, who was “a great builder” and completed much of Aberdeen Cathedral.¹⁴⁷ In 1406 Robert III sent his ten year-old son James to France, in order to protect him from assassination by Scottish rivals for the succession. However, the prince was captured in route by English merchant-pirates and then imprisoned by King Henry IV for eighteen years.

In the 1440's, when Walter Bower continued the *Scotichronicon*, he described the kidnapped James as another “Joseph led into Egypt,” who managed to pursue a Solomonic course of self-education during his long captivity.¹⁴⁸ Allowed some periods of relative freedom, James studied “knowledge of the Scripture with incredible zeal,” and made “the effort of learning the skills connected with all the mechanical arts.” Deeply interested in architecture, he assimilated Continental design and construction trends when he accompanied Henry IV to France. James not only studied the operative arts involved in masonry and design but he enjoyed the architectural fantasies of the English poet John Lydgate, who described a Gothic “Temple of Glass.”¹⁴⁹ He was evidently inspired by Lydgate's panegyric to the near-magical skills of master masons and their craftsmen, whose labors the poet observed carefully.

In his *Troy Book* (1412–20), Lydgate described Priam's determination to build a new city at Troy which would be beautiful and impregnable because of its “walls of hard stone”:

¹⁴⁶ R. Fawcett, *Scottish Architecture*, 26, 80, 219, 300.

¹⁴⁷ J. Edwards, “Hospitallers,” 63.

¹⁴⁸ W. Bower, *Scotichronicon*, VIII, 309, 329.

¹⁴⁹ P. Frankl, *Gothic*, 194–97; John Lydgate, *Lydgate's Temple of Glas*, ed. J. Schick. Early English Texts Society (London: Humphrey Milford, 1924), cxxix–cxliii.

He made search in every region
 For such workmen as were curious
 Of Wit inventive, of casting marvellous;
 Or such as could craft of geometry,
 Or were subtile in her fantasy;
 And for everyone that was good deviser,
 Mason, hewer, or crafty quarrier . . .
 The worker began this site to found,
 Full meetly with stones square and round,
 That in this world was to it none like
 Of workmanship, nor of building rich,
 Nor of crate of curious masonry.

I know no terms to speak of geometry,
 Wherefore as now I must them set aside;
 For doubtless I read never Euclid,
 That be master and be founder was
 Of all that work by square or compass,
 Or keep her measure by level or by line;
 I am too rude lerly [learnedly] to define
 Or to describe this work in every part,
 For lack of terms belonging to that art . . .¹⁵⁰

After his release and accession to the Scottish throne in 1424, King James I launched major architectural projects. Glendinning observes that the architectural showpiece of the Stewarts' building drive was Linlithgow, first reconstructed under Master of Work John de Waltoun in 1425–37 and referred to from 1429 as a “palace”—apparently the first use of this description in Scotland.¹⁵¹ James I also took great interest in the construction of the new University of St. Andrews, which led the chronicler Hector Boece (a century later) to link the king's patronage of masonic projects with his determination to regenerate Scotland spiritually and materially. At St. Andrews, “King James, to augment his commonweal, and to cause his lieges increase in more vertue, brought many noble craftsmen out of France, Flanders, and other parts.”¹⁵² Because the Scots “were exercised in war con-

¹⁵⁰ John Lydgate, *Lydgate's Troy Book*, ed. Henry Bergen. Early English Texts Society (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1906), Part 1, 158–60. I have modernized the spelling.

¹⁵¹ Miles Glendinning, Ranald MacInnes, Aonghus MacKechnie, *A History of Scottish Architecture: From the Renaissance to the Present Day* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1996), 9.

¹⁵² Hector Boece, *The History and Chronicles of Scotland*, trans. by John Bellenden (Edinburgh: W. and C. Tait, 1821), II, 505. I have modernized the spelling.

tinual," many craftsmen were slain by the enemy. Boece implied that this Stewart king was responsible for the revival of masonry as an organized activity—thus giving an early hint of the traditional link between the Stewart dynasty and the masonic craft. In 1738, when Anderson characterised James I as "the best King of Scotland," who "countenanced the Lodges with his Presence as the Royal Grand Master," he added a marginal note, "This is the Tradition of the old Scottish Masons, and found in their Records."¹⁵³

James I's admirer Boece was especially proud of the "hewn stone" utilized by Scottish masons for churches, colleges, and bridges. But he also made clear that the king's interest in the craft of building included an ethical and intellectual component:

This noble prince was so full of virtue, that he held all men of science in great reverence; giving his perpetual business to cause his people increase in all crafts and virtue, and to bring themselves honor and glory, to their posterity. And that his citizens should learn pleasant and honest crafts, to remove their idle and rude manners . . . at his first returning to Scotland, he thought no thing as good as to bring craftsmen and expert clerks out of uncouth realms, to decorate his commonweal . . . Great felicity succeeded to Scots in his days; as the proverb says, "Happy are the people that has a philosopher to be their king."¹⁵⁴

The fact that James drew upon English, French, and other Continental sources for his architectural designs and craftsmen was particularly significant for the preservation in Scotland of the accumulated Solomonic-Hermetic traditions of the Gothic lodges. In a rare surviving document of medieval masonry, the Cooke MS. (ca. 1400), the scribe recounted in English a legendary history of the craft. Though national variations undoubtedly existed, he drew on earlier traditions that were common to the building guilds in Italy, Spain, France, England, and Scotland. According to the MS., when masons were taught the methods and rules of their trade, they also received instruction in its secret history.

Drawing on a mélange of sources (the Bible, Josephus, Philo, Hebrew apocrypha, *Sepher Yetzirah*, Hermetica, neo-Platonic and classical texts), the scribe claimed that the science of geometry and masonry was first discovered by Jabal before the Flood. Jabal then

¹⁵³ J. Anderson, *Constitutions* (1738), 88.

¹⁵⁴ H. Boece, *History*, II, 486.

became Cain's master mason at the building of Enoch, the first city recorded in the Bible. Knoop points out that Enoch in Hebrew (*Hanokh*) means "training, dedication," and implies "initiation."¹⁵⁵ Nimrod taught his workmen the craft of masonry—an account embellished from extra-Biblical Hebrew sources. The author notes that older books of charges reveal that Abraham taught Euclid geometry—a point taken from the *Sepher Yetzirah*. Then, in a section that must have been particularly attractive to Scottish masons, the overpopulation of Egypt was recounted, which caused the lords to beg Euclid to found a craft for their children. Thus, Euclid taught the children the art of geometry, which they carried to their new homes. The parallels with the story of Gathelus and Scota in Egypt and the dispersal of their children are striking.

From the apocryphal Hebrew *Vita Adae et Evae* and from Josephus, the author recounted the prediction given to Eve by the archangel that the Lord will inflict a judgment by fire and water on the children of Adam. To preserve the astronomical discoveries of Seth (or Enoch), they should be carved on two pillars of marble and baked brick to withstand the catastrophe. Adding touches from the Hermetic literature, the author stated that the two pillars were set up by the sons of Lamech, who engraved upon them the Seven Liberal Arts, which were later recovered by Hermes and Pythagoras (the former thus "discovering" geometry, the latter music). After learning the craft of masonry in Egypt, the children of Israel moved to Jerusalem, where King David began building Solomon's Temple. David loved well masons and gave them charges that are still in use. Solomon employed ".iiij. score thousand masons" at his work, and the king's son of Tyre [Hiram] was his master mason:

And in other chronicles it is said and in old books of masonry that Salomon confirmed by charges that David his father had given to masons. And Salomon himself taught them their manner but little different from the manners that now are used. And from thence his worthy science was brought in to France and in to many other regions.¹⁵⁶

The Cooke MS. goes on to claim that the French king Charles Martel had become a mason before assuming the throne; moreover, he

¹⁵⁵ Douglas Knoop, G.P. Jones, and Douglas Hamer, eds., *The Two Earliest Masonic MSS.* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1938), 31–32, 159n.178–89.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 100–01. I have modernized the spelling.

loved and cherished masons and gave them charges and manners that are still used in France. The rationale behind the identification of Charles Martel (686–741) with masonry has long puzzled historians, for there is no surviving evidence of his accomplishments in architecture. However, in the thirteenth century, the masons of Paris claimed that Charles had granted them special privileges—“the mortarers had been released from guard duty, likewise the stonemasons, ever since the time of Charles Martel, as the wise men have heard it said from father to son.”¹⁵⁷ By the fourteenth century, as masonic guilds in England and France struggled to maintain their privileges and independence from intrusions by crown and church, some craftsmen may have admired Martel’s defiance of the Papacy and his confiscation of church goods in order to supply and pay his soldiers. Again, this legend would be particularly attractive in Scotland, where Robert the Bruce had been excommunicated by an arrogant Pope.

The designation of Charles Martel as a hero of masonry was also rooted in his spectacular victories over the Saracens in southern France. Some chroniclers claimed that he established the first order of knighthood, leading the eighteenth-century historian Edward Gibbon to describe Martel and his warriors as “the true Peers and Paladins of French Chivalry.”¹⁵⁸ The crusading role of Martel would identify him with the Templars, who were indeed great builders in stone. Martel also shared a posthumous fate with the Templars, for the Papacy undertook a concerted effort to blacken his reputation. In another English masonic document, the “Regius MS.” (ca. 1390), no mention was made of Martel by the Catholic priest who wrote the poem. Though Martel had been eulogized in various French romances, a hostile churchman later claimed that he was eternally damned for his seizure of ecclesiastic property. Gibbon, who was a Mason and descendant of a Jacobite family, was evidently aware of the Franco-Scottish tradition of Masonic sympathy for Martel.¹⁵⁹ His stress on Martel’s role as patriot king, who “was summoned by the voice of his country,” would evoke echoes of Bruce and Stewart nationalistic

¹⁵⁷ P. Frankl, *Gothic*, 117.

¹⁵⁸ Edward Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (1766–88; Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1990), II, 293–94.

¹⁵⁹ Gibbon was a member of the Friendship Lodge in London in 1775 and associated with *Écossais* Masons on the Continent; see W.R. Denslow, *Ten Thousand Famous Freemasons*. Transactions of Missouri Lodge of Research, vol. 16 (1959), II, 107; E.J. Barron, “Gibbon the Historian,” *AQC*, 10 (1897), 162.

lore among *Écossais* Masons. Gibbon's further stress on Martel's role as "Mayor of the Palace" hinted at the similar role of the Stewarts as "Royal Stewards" and hereditary patrons of Freemasonry.

In the Cooke MS., the profusion of Jewish lore included a discrete hint at the Cabalistic mystery of the *Shekinah*, the female manifestation of God. Drawing on the *Sepher Yetzirah*, the author gave the name "Naamah" as the wife of Noah. According to Knoop, "the linking together of Tubalcain and Naamah suggests the union in Greek mythology of Hephaestos (Vulcan) and Aphrodite (Venus)."¹⁶⁰ This union or chemical marriage also occurred in alchemical literature. Though the masonic manuscript does not explicitly identify Naamah as a goddess of love, it does suggest her role as "a form of Minerva as patroness of female arts." That the Gothic builders retained a vague tradition of the *Shekinah* is further suggested by the architectural fantasies of various contemporary poets.

In the *House of Fame* (1381), Geoffrey Chaucer described a temple of glass in which "rich tabernacles" honor "the figure of Venus naked, floating on the sea."¹⁶¹ In *The Court of Love* (early 1400's), an anonymous poet portrayed a magnificent castle which contains a temple or tabernacle of Venus, shining with windows all of glass.¹⁶² But more relevant to Scottish masonry was Lydgate's architectural vision in *The Temple of Glas* (1410), in which history's great lovers were portrayed in a Gothic temple, dedicated to the power of sexual love. Frankl observes that the medieval church may have banished the cult of Aphrodite-Venus, but she survived in the "fantasy architecture" of the poets.¹⁶³ However, the association of the love goddess with the tabernacle and temple points to older roots in the Jewish *Shekinah*, the "Hebrew Goddess" who was discretely preserved in the extra-Biblical Hebrew lore of medieval masonic traditions. Among the admirers of Chaucer and Lydgate was the Scottish king James I, who was influenced by their descriptions of the temple of Venus in his own poem, *The Kingis Quair* ("King's Treatise"). That the manuscript of James's poem was preserved by the St. Clair family of Roslin would later take on masonic significance.

As part of James I's ambitious architectural program, he established in 1429 a Carthusian monastery at Perth, where a great char-

¹⁶⁰ D. Knoop, *Two Earliest*, 162n.235-55.

¹⁶¹ P. Frankl, *Gothic*, 194.

¹⁶² J. Lydgate, *Temple of Glas*, cxxix-cxxx.

¹⁶³ P. Frankl, *Gothic*, 197.

terhouse was built. Though nothing survives today of this once magnificent Gothic structure, a later poem revealed its role in the history of Scottish masonry. In *The Muses Threnodie* (1638), the Scottish poet Henry Adamson remembered:

The Charterhouse of Perth, a mightie frame,
Vallis virtutis by a mystick name, . . .
This abbayes, stiples, and its turrets . . .

Were cunningly contriv'd with curious art,
And quintessence of skill in everie part;
My grandsire many times to me hath told it
He knew their names this mightie frame who moldit:
Italians some, and some were French men borne,
Whose matchless skill this great work did adorne.
And living were in Perth some of their race
When that, alace, demolish'd was this place,
For greatnesse, beautie, statlinesse so fair
In Britans Isle, was said, none might compare.

Even as Apelles for to prove his skill
In limming Venus with a perfect quill,
Did not on some one beautie take inspection,
But of all beauties borrowed the perfection:
Even so this Prince [James I] to policie inclinde,
Did not on some one fabrick set his minde
To make the prototype of his designe,
But from all works did all perfections bring,
And rarest paterns brought from everie part,
Where any brave Vitruvius kyth'd his art,
So that this great and princelie enterprise
Perfection of all models did comprise . . .¹⁶⁴

Adamson went on to link this masonic project with the tradition of King David I, whose zeal unto God's house made him a successor of "Israel's David," and he lamented the loss of the Stone of Scone from its former "Temple" mount:

. . . that famous Earthen Mount,
Whereon our kings to crowned be were wont:
And while we do consider, there we found
Demonstrat was the quadrat of the round,
Which Euclid could not finde, nor Pater Erra,
By guesse we did it find on Omnis terra.
And if you Geometers hereof do doubt,
Come view the place, and ye shall finde it out . . .¹⁶⁵

¹⁶⁴ H. Adamson, *Muses Threnodie*, 10.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 22, 83.

Adamson's retrospective view of Scottish masonic history suggests that the Jewish visionary tradition and Solomonic lore became institutionalized in the craft fraternity by the time of James I, who drew upon the eclectic, multicultural synthesis developed earlier in Mediterranean countries.

James I shared the crusading ideals of his ancestors, and he encouraged a "cult of honour" among his courtiers.¹⁶⁶ Moreover, he developed a sense of pacific chivalry, and his "tournaments were turned from quasi-battles into courtly displays." Expressive of that transformation was the mission of Sir John Stewart of Darnley, who made one of the first peaceful pilgrimages to Jerusalem.¹⁶⁷ During his return journey, Stewart fought with French forces against the English at Orleans—thus continuing the linkage between Scottish nationalists and crusaders. After Stewart's death in battle in 1429, James honored his chivalric valor in 1430 by granting privileges to the Hospitallers to remodel their Preceptory at Torpichen. After James was murdered in 1437, his admirers determined to take his heart to Jerusalem. It was probably Alexander Seton of Gordon who undertook the pilgrimage, and when Seton lay dying in the East he bequeathed his goods to the Grand Master of the Hospitallers at Rhodes. In 1444 an unnamed Knight of St. John of Jerusalem travelled from Rhodes to Scotland, bearing the heart of James for burial in the Charterhouse at Perth.

The murder of James I haunted Bower, who lamented in the *Scotichronicon* that the king, so Solomonic in other ways, did not follow Solomon's advice to maintain a select bodyguard always at his side:

Thus in the Wisdom of Solomon it is said: "Look; there is Solomon carried in his litter; sixty of Israel's bravest warriors are his escort, all carrying swords, all trained to handle arms, each with his sword at his side to ward off the demons of the night."¹⁶⁸

Bower was also thinking of the practice of the French kings, who since 1425 employed a permanent personal bodyguard of Scottish archers. In 1736 the Jacobite Mason Ramsay informed his Parisian lodge brothers that the splendor of "our Order" was preserved "among

¹⁶⁶ M. Glendinning, *History*, 6.

¹⁶⁷ A. Macquarrie, *Scotland*, 92–93.

¹⁶⁸ W. Bower, *Scotichronicon*, VIII, 329.

those Scotsmen to whom the Kings of France confided during many centuries the safeguard of their royal persons.”¹⁶⁹ Baigent and Leigh argue that the Scots Guard was “a neo-Templar institution, much more so than such purely chivalric orders as the Garter, the Star, and the Golden Fleece.”¹⁷⁰ They also quote a member of the present-day Seton (Montgomery) family who claims that the private “Order of the Temple”—a semi-Masonic, semi-chivalric order—descended from the Scots Guard.

The connection of the Scots Guard with Templar and Masonic traditions possibly began at Roslin Castle, home of William St. Clair, Earl of Orkney and Caithness, who gained lasting fame as a patron of Solomonite architecture. The St. Clairs maintained important ties with France, and they contributed personnel to the Scots Guard. According to later Masonic tradition, William St. Clair was appointed “Patron and Protector of Scottish Masons” by James II in 1441, and the office became hereditary in the family.¹⁷¹ On the basis of the surviving St. Clair Charters (dated ca. 1600 and 1627), Stevenson argues that the tradition was based on historical fact and linked with the construction of Roslin Chapel.¹⁷² The St. Clairs’ hereditary role in Freemasonry was still recognized in 1678, according to the report of an English visitor to Scotland:

The Lairds of Roslin have been great architects and patrons of buildings for many generations. They are obliged to receive the Mason’s word which is a secret signal masons have throughout the world to know one another by. They alledge it is as old as since Babel, when they could not understand one another and they conversed by signs. Others would have it no older than Solomon. However it is, he that hath it will bring his brother mason to him without calling to him or your perceiving the signe.¹⁷³

Though the Mason Word functioned primarily as a means of secretly identifying a fellow craftsman, it also took on occult connotations through its association with Cabalistic word-play and prophetic vision

¹⁶⁹ C. Batham, “Ramsay,” 303.

¹⁷⁰ M. Baigent and R. Leigh, *Temple*, 135, 148–57. Curiously, they seem unaware of Ramsay’s claim.

¹⁷¹ J. Anderson calls him a Grand Master, in *Constitutions (1738)*, 89; see also [W. Auld], *Free-Masons’ Pocket Companion*, 112.

¹⁷² D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 52–57.

¹⁷³ HMC 29: *13th Report, Appendix ii, Portland MSS.* (London, 1893–94), II, 56; D. Knoop and R. Jones, *Genesis*, 88.

(“second sight”). From the eclectic enthusiasms of William St. Clair in the 1450’s, it seems likely that a merging of crusader, masonic, and occult lore—which prefigures illuminist Freemasonry—took place during the construction of Roslin Chapel. An earlier St. Clair, Henry, had signed the Declaration of Arbroath, in which Scottish patriots were identified with the Jewish Maccabees who restored the Temple of Jerusalem. The family had long been associated with the crusades, and Sir William St. Clair was given literary immortality in *The Bruce* for his effort to carry Robert I’s heart to Jerusalem and his subsequent death in Spain while fighting against the Saracens.¹⁷⁴ In 1446 his descendant, also named William, began constructing the fantastic Gothic church at Roslin, which featured exotic “Hiramic” symbolism.

In the midst of the building project in 1456, St. Clair employed a Scottish knight, Sir Gilbert Hay, in the Roslin scriptorium to translate into Scots English *L’Ordre de Chivalrie* by Ramon Lull, *L’Arbre des Batailles* by Honoré Bonet, and *Le Gouvernement des Princes* attributed to Aristotle.¹⁷⁵ These manuscripts, beautifully bound together, remained in the St. Clair family until the early seventeenth-century. The significance of a possible Lullist influence on the St. Clairs’ conception of masonry will be dealt with later, but for now it is important to note that Gilbert Hay previously spent twenty-four years as “chamberlain to the French king,” a position associated with the Scots Guard. An ancestor of Gilbert Hay signed the Declaration of Arbroath, and he was heir to a family tradition of Maccabean patriotism and crusader idealism. When William St. Clair requested that Hay translate the three French treatises, he shared the knight’s nostalgia for a lost golden age of chivalry.

Even more importantly, St. Clair shared Hay’s and Lull’s desire to reform the education and training of knights to make them “illuminated” contributors to the well-being of the nation. Hay’s translation of Lull was the first in English (preceding William Caxton’s 1484 London publication), and he felt free to enlarge upon points that he believed important for Scotland. As noted earlier, Lull had served as seneschal at the Majorcan court, a role equivalent to steward at the Scottish court. St. Clair currently served as chancellor to

¹⁷⁴ N. Barbour, *Bruce*, I, 189–90.

¹⁷⁵ Gilbert Hay, *Gilbert of the Haye’s Prose Manuscript (A.D. 1456)*, ed. J.H. Stevenson (Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1901), I, xxvi–xxix.

James II, descendant of the royal stewards, and he sensed a particular relevance in Lull's treatise on the necessity of chivalric virtue in king and knights. In the translation that Hay produced for St. Clair, Lull began by comparing kings and orders of knighthood to the astrological order of the heavens, which makes knowledge of the "influences celestials" important to good governance.¹⁷⁶

When Lull described the "form of the examination how the bachelor squire suld be examined by the fatheres of the order," St. Clair perhaps compared it to the examinations required of his stonemasons by their master masons. The requirment that "gloves of plate" be given to the newly initiated knight seemed close to the similar requirement concerning gloves of leather for the masons. In 1737 an anti-Jacobite Freemason warned the English government about the hidden military significance of Scottish Masonic traditions concerning gloves: "There seems to be something emblematical in the *Glove*," which is "only another Word for a *Gauntlet*, which is a *Piece of Armour* for the *Hands*."¹⁷⁷ Like the masons and their patriotic Scottish patrons, the Lullian knights should enjoy and protect their freedom and mobility—for "all knights are free by their order, for knighthood and freedom accords together right well to the royal majesty and lordship."

After Lull referred to the "good ancient customs" that made earlier knights yearn "to go in the Holy Land," he called on new knights to imitate Judas Maccabeus, who led the Jews in their great revolt against the Syrian king Antiochus and won back control of Jerusalem. Like the Stewart dynasty in their continuing struggle against English attempts at dominance, the Maccabean family fought to preserve the Jewish religion against forced worship of foreign gods, and they managed to rule successfully for a hundred years. Adding his own commentary on Lull's allusion to *I Maccabees* 3:13–26, Hay stressed the capacity of a small force to defeat a vastly larger one, if they are unified and devoted to virtue, reason, and justice.¹⁷⁸ Such chivalric values will earn divine grace, which gives victory over the greatest odds.

At the same time, Hay's patron St. Clair and his masons must have been inspired by the heroic construction work of the Maccabeans.

¹⁷⁶ For the following points, see Gilbert Hay, *The Prose Works of Sir Gilbert Hay*, ed. Jonathan Glenn (Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society, 1993), III, 13–14, 26, 36, 51. I have modernized the spelling.

¹⁷⁷ Letter from "Jackin," *Gentleman's Magazine* (April 1737), VII, 226–28.

¹⁷⁸ G. Hay, *Prose Works*, III, 40–41, 150–51.

The Hebrew word *Maccabaeus* means “hammerer,” thus provoking echoes of the masonic hero Charles Martel (“the hammer”) and new associations with the hammerers working at Roslin. In order to protect their people, the Jewish masons “encircled Mount Zion with high walls and strong towers to prevent the Gentiles from coming and trampling it down as they had done before.”¹⁷⁹ Similar motives lay behind the architectural fortification of Roslin Castle. As St. Clair’s masons implemented his Solomonian design for Roslin Chapel, they may have identified with the Jewish masons’ efforts to purify and restore the Temple.

Provocatively, the odd admonitions in the Biblical account—priest-masons must have no physical blemish; unhewn stones must replace profaned ones; buried stones must wait for purification by a prophet—would later surface in the confused oral traditions of masonic lodges. It is possible that the tradition of the winged cherubim who hover over the ark—symbolism that later surfaced in Jewish-Jacobite Freemasonry—was preserved in oral traditions, especially Cabalistic ones, about the Maccabees. Patai argues that the sculpture of copulating cherubim—which was publicly exposed and ridiculed by King Antiochus—was almost certainly restored by Judas Maccabeus, who was determined to recreate every detail of the original Temple.¹⁸⁰

While translating Bonet’s treatise into *The Buke of the Law of Armys*, Hay stressed the superior rule of the Pope over the Emperor—the argument made by the Templars and Duns Scotus before the victory of Philip the Fair.¹⁸¹ However, Bonet was influenced by Lull and shared his acquiescence in the dissolution of the Temple. Perhaps reacting to lingering sympathy for the Templars, Bonet stressed the Pope’s right to punish any man—Christian, Jew, or Saracen—who acted “against the law of nature.” However, the Pope cannot punish Jews and Saracens for not accepting the Gospel, “for faith should not be compelled by force.” Thus, it is unlawful to make war against the Jews, for from their subjection they cannot hurt the Church, and there is prophecy to be fulfilled with which Christians should not interfere. The only exception to this policy of tolerance is made for crusading knights, who carry on the tradition of Godfrey of Bouillon

¹⁷⁹ J. Bartlett, *Maccabees*, 63.

¹⁸⁰ R. Patai, *Hebrew Goddess*, 126, 131.

¹⁸¹ G. Hay, *Prose Works*, I, lxxxv–lxxxvi, 104–07, 294–95.

and the Christian kings of Jerusalem in their effort to recapture Jerusalem and restore the Temple.

In his third translation, *The Buke of the Governauce of Princes*, Hay provided his patron with a plethora of Hermetic and Cabalistic themes which became part of the secret tradition of Scottish Freemasonry—perhaps through the influence of St. Clair. Hay worked from a French translation of the pseudo-Aristotelian *Secretum Secretorum*.¹⁸² The original Arabic text had been translated into Latin in the thirteenth century by Philip of Tripoli, a French-speaking churchman who collaborated with the Knights Hospitallers in the Outremer. As noted earlier, Michael Scot, Roger Bacon, and Duns Scotus studied the *Secretum*, which they believed to be an authentic account of Aristotle's beliefs on morals, politics, and magic. By the fifteenth century, some English scholars believed it was written by John Scotus Erigena, who allegedly found the manuscript in the Temple of the Sun, built by Aesculapius. This merging of Hermetic, Egyptian, Hospitaller, and "Scottish" context makes the association of the *Secretum* with the masonic patron St. Clair particularly suggestive.

In Hay's version of the *Secretum*, the noble philosopher Aesculapius had Aristotle's book translated out of Chaldean, the language of Babylon, and then placed the book in the Temple of the Sun, where it was discovered by a clerk named "fair pateris" (*beau Patrice*). As Glenn notes, by the later Middle Ages Aesculapius was firmly connected with the Hermetic tradition, especially through the pseudo-Apuleian *Asclepius*, and the temple probably referred to Heliopolis in Egypt.¹⁸³ When the young Alexander of Macedonia asks Aristotle to teach him the "art magical" and "art alchemical," the philosopher reveals the teachings of Hermogines (Hermes Trismegistus) on man as microcosm, man and his two angels, and the correspondences between the natural and celestial world. He also stresses the esoteric nature of these teachings, which should not be revealed to the unworthy, and exacts an oath of secrecy, with threats of divine punishment, from his pupil.

A wise prince must learn to use secret means of communication ("documents in secret words by examples, signs, and figures covertly"), and to employ trustworthy secretaries who can write and transmit secret matters. Both the prince and the messengers must develop a

¹⁸² Ibid., ix; W. Ryan, *Pseudo-Aristotle*, 1-2, 55-72, 92.

¹⁸³ G. Hay, *Prose Works*, III, 56, 154.

strong memory in order to maintain their secret lore and communications, and they must develop related skills in mathematics and accounting so that numbers stored in the memory can be retrieved at will. As we shall see, training in the Art of Memory—with a heavy mathematical component—would become a requirement in the initiation of Scottish masons. Though the first written evidence of this requirement appears in 1599, it may have existed among the masons working at Roslin in 1456.¹⁸⁴ Moreover, Hay and St. Clair probably utilized Lull's Art of Memory, at the same time that they studied his Art of Chivalry.

Hay, via Aristotle, further argued that the most important magical arts to understand are astronomy and physiognomy, and kings should establish schools to teach them according to "our master Plato." Astrology, the most important division of astronomy, is defined as the science of the signs and tokens of the firmament and the judgment of their conditions and impressions. Though Hay did not include the text's full section on physiognomy, he made clear that it was considered an "illuminated" art, which was revealed by God to "our old ancient fathers & philosophers & prophets that were holy men." The capacity to read the signs and tokens of a person's inner nature as a correspondence to celestial governance is to be used as a service to the prince and his realm. In another translation made for St. Clair, *The Buik of King Alexander the Conqueror*, Hay wrote extensively on the techniques and importance of physiognomy, which he related to the magical, necromantical, astrological, and mathematical arts of the Egyptians.¹⁸⁵

In Hay's *Buke of Governaunce*, there is also an emphasis on social mobility by merit, for the king is advised to recognize that a virtuous man who possesses talent should be allowed to rise in the royal service, regardless of his low birth. St. Clair, who worked as an architect and master mason with his artisans, may have implemented this "illuminated" advice in his relationships with the masons. The equality "on the level" of aristocrat and artisan within the lodge became the hallmark of later Freemasonry. At this time, there is evidence of "a gradual emergence of local schools of stone-building throughout most of Scotland, extending to a widening circle of

¹⁸⁴ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 49.

¹⁸⁵ Gilbert Hay, *The Buik of King Alexander the Conqueror*, ed. John Cartwright (Edinburgh: Scottish Texts Society, 1986), XVI, xix–xx, 8, 12; XVIII, 22–33.

patrons.”¹⁸⁶ Under the influence of the masonic leader St. Clair, they may have incorporated the esoteric lore advocated by the *Secretum* for Alexander’s schools and by Lull for the Hospitallers’ schools.

While Hay worked at Roslin castle, St. Clair was busily engaged in designing and implementing his fantastic Gothic vision for Roslin Church. The design and symbolism suggest his awareness of the Judeo-Arabic lore that infused Gothic architecture in the East and Spain. In fact, it was probably a Spanish mason—or a mason who had visited Spain—who executed his patron’s Solomonic vision.¹⁸⁷ Baron notes that during this period (the 1450’s) in Spain, there was much collaboration between Jewish and Christian artisans, for “Jewish apprentices were often trained by Christian masters and vice versa.”¹⁸⁸ It was probably through Jewish masons that Cabalistic influences emerged in Spanish architecture—influences revealed also in contemporary Spanish Bible illustrations which portray Solomon’s Temple as a Gothic church.¹⁸⁹ This collaborative training and cross-fertilization also occurred in the building guilds of Sicily, where a Jewish master-builder was in charge of building the royal palace, and in the southern communities of Italy and France. That St. Clair had access to this eclectic Solomonic lore is further suggested by one of his descendants, Richard Hay, who claimed that the earl “caused artificers to be brought from other regions and forraigne kingdoms” that the “worke might be the more rare.”¹⁹⁰

What is unusual about St. Clair’s role is that he personally acted as “master of the works” and supervised the designing and cutting of patterns for the intricate and exotic Gothic designs carved in the church. Cruden argues that St. Clair’s “keen and practical interest” in architecture and masonry was undeniable; however, “the sculptural oddities, peculiarities of construction, the difficulties which the masons got themselves into, the mystery of the great closing wall” indicate the work of “an inspired amateur with pronounced heraldic tendencies.”¹⁹¹ This description points forward to the role

¹⁸⁶ Geoffrey Stell, “Architecture: the Changing Needs of Society,” in Jennifer Brown, ed., *Scottish Society in the Fifteenth Century* (London: Edward Arnold, 1977), 165.

¹⁸⁷ R. Gould, *History*, I, 286.

¹⁸⁸ S. Baron, *Social*, XII, 49–55.

¹⁸⁹ William Swaan, *The Gothic Cathedral* (New York: Doubleday, 1969), 84; J. Guttman, *Temple*, 58.

¹⁹⁰ Richard A. Hay, *Genealogie of the Saintclaires of Rossllyn* (Edinburgh, 1835), 27.

¹⁹¹ Stewart Cruden, *Scottish Medieval Churches* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1986), 196.

of non-operative or gentleman Freemasons in seventeenth-century lodges.¹⁹²

Among the profusion of lavish and bizarre carvings at Roslin, the most striking is the "Apprentice Pillar," which features spiralled bands of foliage wrapped around its bundled miniature shafts.¹⁹³ In an account based on St. Clair family tradition, a writer in 1774 claimed that the model for "this beautiful pillar" had been sent "from Rome, or some foreign place," but the master mason insisted on travelling to see the original before he would attempt such a complicated work.¹⁹⁴ While he was gone, an apprentice carved the pillar so exquisitely that the master mason, on his return, became jealous and killed the apprentice. Above the west door of the chapel, there is the carved head of a young man with a gash on his head, while opposite him is the head of the bearded master mason who murdered him. To the right there is the head of a woman, called "the Widowed Mother," and it is perhaps from Roslin that the ritual term "Sons of the Widow" became synonymous with free masons.¹⁹⁵

Behind the eighteenth-century account of the Apprentice Pillar lay the ancient Jewish tradition of twisted columns, such as the two at St. Peter's in Rome which, according to medieval commentators, came from Solomon's Temple. The pillars of Jachin and Boaz that became such important symbols in Freemasonry were often portrayed as twisted with spiraling decorations, and they appear in illustrated medieval manuscripts of Josephus. Scottish knights who made pilgrimages to former Templar centers probably saw the twisted and knotted pillars constructed by the Templars, who were aware of the quasi-magical powers vested in such Jewish designs. During the fifteenth century, Scottish visitors to the Hospitaller capital at Rhodes not only observed the surviving Solomonian architecture of the Templars, but they also learned of the shared magical interests of the knights and the local Jews. In his study of Jewish craft guilds, Wischnitzer reveals the unusually tolerant attitude of the Knights of St. John towards the large Jewish community at Rhodes.¹⁹⁶ Throughout the

¹⁹² Arthur E. Waite, *A New Encyclopaedia of Freemasonry* (1921; New York: Weathervane, 1970), II, 28.

¹⁹³ R. Fawcett, *Scottish Architecture*, 172 and plate 5.34.

¹⁹⁴ Philo-Roskelynsis, *An Account of the Chapel of Roslin* (Edinburgh, 1774), 28.

¹⁹⁵ M. Baigent and R. Leigh, *Temple*, 160; Kenneth R.H. Mackenzie, *The Royal Masonic Cyclopaedia*, introd. R.A. Gilbert and John Hamill (1875–77; Wellingborough: Aquarian, 1987), 682, 768.

¹⁹⁶ M. Wischnitzer, *History*, 135–36.

fifteenth century, the Jews manufactured daggers and swords for the Hospitallers, who included Scottish knights, and they helped them defend the island against the Turkish attack of 1481.¹⁹⁷

Given their own Hospitaller connections, the St. Clairs were probably aware of the Jewish tradition that the twisted pillars of Jachin and Boaz played a double role: "they emphasise, on the one hand, the personal relationship between the Temple and the royal family and, on the other, the presence of God within the Temple."¹⁹⁸ The appeal of such symbolism to the Solomonic ideals of Stewart kings and Scottish masons is obvious. For the masons at Roslin, the Apprentice Pillar would have conjured up the legend of Hiram, master mason of Solomon's Temple who was murdered by jealous assistants because he would not reveal the secret "word" of the Master. The Roslin carver probably also drew on the French *compagnonnage* tradition in which "Maitre Jacques, one of the first masters of Solomon, and a colleague of Solomon" was murdered by treacherous stonemasons. As noted earlier, the French "Sons of Solomon" claimed that this death occurred "at the destruction of the temples"—a probable reference to the dissolution of the Templars.

After the death of James II on the battlefield in 1460, Earl William St. Clair acted as regent during the minority of the young James III.¹⁹⁹ However, the king's Danish marriage made it necessary for him to gain royal possession of the Orkney and Shetland islands and thus, in effect, deprive St. Clair of his earldom. Though St. Clair was compensated with other properties, he withdrew from participation at court and began a process of strengthening his own control over the family's remaining Scottish possessions. It is possible that St. Clair utilized his role as hereditary master of the masonic craft to develop local loyalties to him that could withstand further royal incursions. In 1600, when a question arose about the continued legitimacy of the St. Clair claim to hereditary masonic leadership, the controversy occurred in a context of struggle between independent magnates and the Stuart crown. Meanwhile, in the 1460's, as St. Clair's income declined, work on Roslin Chapel slowed down over the next decades. Sadly, the grandiose "temple" was never

¹⁹⁷ A. Macquarrie, *Scotland*, 93.

¹⁹⁸ "Jachin and Boaz," *EJ*.

¹⁹⁹ Barbara Crawford, "William Sinclair, Earl of Orkney, and His Family: A Study in the Politics of Survival," in K.J. Stringer, ed., *Essays on the Nobility of Medieval Scotland* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1985), 232–51.

completed, but its flamboyant stone-carvings remained a subject of awe among Scottish masons.²⁰⁰

Though James III deprived St. Clair of power and lands, he too carried out an ambitious architectural policy. In fact, the king took such an active role in building projects that he was criticized for paying more attention to his artists than his nobles.²⁰¹ Contemporaries noted that James “prized arts and learning, and admitted to his friendship not only scholars, but craftsmen who had shown skill above the ordinary in what were counted base and mechanic arts.”²⁰² After James’s death, legends accumulated about the negative influence exercised on him by Thomas Cochrane, who was called a mason, master mason, or architect by various chroniclers.²⁰³ Anderson claimed that the king named Cochrane a Grand Master.²⁰⁴ James III, in collaboration with Cochrane, was credited with designing and constructing the Great Hall at Stirling Castle and other outstanding Gothic edifices. In the seventeenth century, the poet Drummond of Hawthornden described Cochrane as “surveyor of the royal buildings” and praised the architectural accomplishments of James III’s reign: “The rarest Frames of Churches and Palaces in Scotland were mostly raised at this time.”²⁰⁵

James III viewed his architectural enterprises as contributions to chivalric revival. In 1471 he expressed his great affection for the church and buildings at Torpichen, which lamentably had become decayed and ruinous.²⁰⁶ A year later he received an account of a voyage from Italy to Jerusalem written by Anselm Adornes, a Genoa-born merchant, who dedicated his work to the Scottish king.²⁰⁷ Adornes’s volume included many architectural descriptions, including the hexagonal chapels built at Philereinos in Rhodes, where he was the guest of the Grand Master of the Knights Hospitaller.²⁰⁸

²⁰⁰ Roslin Chapel continues to attract Masonic pilgrims from all over the world.

²⁰¹ R. Fawcett, *Scottish Architecture*, xix, 303.

²⁰² Robert L. Mackie, *King James IV of Scotland* (Edinburgh: Tweeddale Court, 1958), 12.

²⁰³ Ibid., 256, 304; Norman Macdougall, *James III: A Political Study* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1982), 288–89.

²⁰⁴ J. Anderson, *Constitutions (1738)*, 89.

²⁰⁵ William Mackay Mackenzie, *The Medieval Castle in Scotland* (New York: B. Blom, 1972), 137.

²⁰⁶ I. Cowan, *Knights of St. John*, xlv.

²⁰⁷ M. Glendinning, *History*, 9.

²⁰⁸ M.E. de La Coste, *Anselme Adorne* (Brussels, 1855).

James was so impressed that he invited Adornes to Scotland, where he made him keeper of Linlithgow Palace in 1477. Adornes befriended Cochrane and consulted with him on architectural projects. Influenced by Adornes's description of the Rhodian architecture undertaken by the Hospitallers, James supervised the construction of a two-storied hexagonal royal chapel at Restalrig. Glendinning notes that "further evidence of Linlithgow's cosmopolitanism, and links to Rhodes," emerges in the construction of a substantial stone-built, four-storied residence for the Hospitallers at nearby Torphichen. However, according to local tradition, it really belonged to the Templars.²⁰⁹

That the Templars were revived or allowed a more public presence by James III is suggested by a surviving document. Shortly after the king's murder in 1488, his fifteen year-old successor, James IV, signed a statement confirming the grants of land "made by his predecessors to the Knights of the Temple and St. John.—*Deo et Sancto Hospitali de Jerusalem et fratribus ejusdem Militiae Templi Salomonis.*" According to Addison,

From that Charter we learn that both Orders were then united and placed under the superintendence of the Preceptor of Saint John, and there can be no doubt that such an arrangement was both natural and political. In Scotland alone the Knights of the Temple possessed independent property, and the ban against them being still in force throughout Europe, their sphere of action was necessarily contracted, whilst on the other hand the Knights of the Hospital were possessed of great influence and wealth, and high in the favour of the Continental sovereigns. Both Orders were therefore represented in the Scottish Parliament by the Preceptor of Saint John; and down to the period of the Reformation the union remained unbroken.²¹⁰

Sire notes that the Scottish knights cultivated a strong attachment to the crown, probably to offset the claims to dominance made by the English Preceptory at Clerkenwell.²¹¹ From the subsequent chivalric activities of James IV, it seems that the 1488 reaffirmation of Templar-Hospitaller privileges made a strong impression on the youthful Heir Apparent.

While the St. Clair family struggled to retain Roslin and other lands, they received help from the Seton family—who shared a tradition

²⁰⁹ D. Macgibbon and T. Ross, *Castellated*, I, 508–13.

²¹⁰ C. Addison, *Knights*, 545.

²¹¹ H. Sire, *Knights*, 185.

of commitment to crusading ideals.²¹² As noted earlier, the Setons were allegedly protectors of the secret Order of the Temple, and they were definitely active in Hospitaller affairs. While Roslin's fantastic "Spanish" chapel remained unfinished, a Seton knight was in Spain, where he participated in the crusade against Granada in 1492.²¹³ Though the turbulent struggles between nobles and crown meant that Scotland was in no position to mount a national crusade, the ideal of a return to Jerusalem and the restoration of the Temple was still preached by leading churchmen. Could Seton's witnessing of the expulsion of the Jews from Spain in 1492 have reinforced this ideal? The goal of a chivalric return to Jerusalem was adopted by the energetic new king James IV, partially as an act of penance for his acquiescence in the political murder of his father. In order to rebuild Scotland's strength—as a prelude to a crusade—James IV worked tirelessly with his military masons, whose expertise and labors contributed to the successful Scottish defense against Henry VII's aggression in 1496.²¹⁴

In that year, James IV also invited William St. Clair to participate with him in a splendid tournament—the first of many designed to revive martial expertise and chivalric *virtú*. James may also have sought St. Clair's support for his building projects, for the magnate's role as hereditary protector of the masons could prove useful to his architectural ambitions. At Linlithgow, the king made a spectacular conclusion to his father's work by adding classical details and "neo-chivalric creations of turreted fantasy."²¹⁵ He enriched the main entrance with sculptural decoration, in which the "flanking image tabernacles" were surmounted by tiered buildings, based on crusader descriptions of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and Dome of the Rock (*Templum Domini*) in Jerusalem. James was determined to revive the services of the Hospitaller order in Scotland and, especially, to repair and rebuild "its houses and half-buried churches."²¹⁶

The king's architectural ideal—which merged crusader with Jewish motifs—was evoked most tellingly in Gavin Douglas's poem, *The Palace of Honour*, which he dedicated to "the triumphant monarch." Douglas seemed to draw on Cabalistic traditions when he described

²¹² B.E. Crawford, "William Sinclair," 245.

²¹³ A. Macquarrie, *Scotland*, 106.

²¹⁴ Norman Macdougall, *James IV* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1989), 123, 130–41.

²¹⁵ M. Glendinning, *History*, 10–11.

²¹⁶ I. Cowan, *Knights of St. John*, xlix.

his meditation that produced a vision of Venus's "bliss perfect" and "perfect joy" and his subsequent visions of Jewish history in a magic mirror.²¹⁷ He visualized Solomon's rich Temple, Ezekiel's fiery Chariot to Paradise, Antiochus's despoliation of the Temple, and the Maccabees' "Knightly deeds." His meditation also allowed him to see the Palace of Honor, which was an idealized version of Linlithgow:

That heavenly Palace all of Crystal clear,
Wrought as me thought of polished beryl stone.
Bezaleel nor Aholiab, but were
Which *Sancta Sanctorum* made most rich and dear,
Nor he that wrought the Temple of Salomon,
Could not perform so craftily a cure [piece of work].²¹⁸

Douglas's direct allusions to Bezalel and Aholiab and indirect allusion to Hiram Abif suggest his familiarity with the traditional lore of masonry. Moreover, Bawcutt notes that Douglas used "highly technical building terms" in his descriptions of the architectural features of the palace.²¹⁹

It would not be unusual at this time for the royalist poet to be associated with a masonic lodge, for his king and bishop actively participated with the operative masons. James IV worked with his trusted counselor Bishop Elphinstone to design new castles and colleges that would reflect their "chivalric aspirations" and "nostalgically medieval" designs.²²⁰ Elphinstone, who had long worked with masons on local building projects, was finalizing plans for the construction of King's College in Aberdeen. According to the historian Boece, Elphinstone "collected great heaps of lime and stones," and he "selected and encouraged skillful stonecutters, masons, and artists."²²¹ To James IV's chivalric ideal, Elphinstone added a theme of Solomonic kingship to his architectural program—perhaps inspired by St. Clair's Hiramite vision at Roslin church.

While designing the chapel for King's College, the bishop studied the Biblical commentaries of Nicholas of Lyra (d. 1349), which

²¹⁷ Gavin Douglas, *The Shorter Poems of Gavin Douglas*, ed. Priscilla Bawcutt (Edinburgh: Blackwood, 1967), 95–101. I have modernized the spelling.

²¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 93.

²¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 200.

²²⁰ R. Fawcett, *Scottish Architecture*, 304–14; Leslie Macfarlane, *William Elphinstone and the Kingdom of Scotland, 1431–1514* (Aberdeen: Aberdeen UP, 1985), 326–37.

²²¹ Hector Boece, *Murthalacensium et Aberdonensium Episcoporum Vitae*, trans. James Moir (Aberdeen: New Spalding Club, 1894), 98.

included detailed, diagrammatic illustrations of the Jerusalem Temple.²²² Nicholas was especially influenced by the Temple mysticism of John Scotus Erigena, which was reinforced by his studies under Duns Scotus at the University of Paris. Like Scotus, he maintained a sympathetic attitude toward the Templars. A colleague also of Ramon Lull, he shared the Spaniard's interest in Jewish and Arabic lore. Nicholas's architectural theories were derived from Jewish informants and authentic Hebrew sources, and he became so expert in Hebrew that his contemporaries believed he was a convert from Judaism.²²³ Edwards argues that his drawings provided "a germ of inspiration for the design of King's College Chapel"—which revealed the Solomonic idealism of Bishop Elphinstone and James IV.²²⁴

That Elphinstone's idealism was shared by his masons is suggested in the Latin inscription he had carved on a wall of the college in 1500: "By grace of the most serene, illustrious and ever-victorious King James IV: On the fourth before the nones of April in the year one-thousand five-hundred the masons began to build this excellent college."²²⁵ According to Edwards, the bishop chose the 2 April date because of his belief that Solomon began building the Temple on that date. He further notes that the Latin word *latomi* (masons), used in the inscription, appears in the Vulgate only in references to the builders of Solomon's Temple. In surviving building accounts at the college, there are many references to the Temple—thus suggesting that the craftsmen were cognizant of their Solomonic task. Stevenson comments that it "is surprising that an inscription of this sort should specifically mention the craftsmen responsible for the work at all, yet here they are standing beside the king."²²⁶

For James IV, the expertise of his military masons contributed to his successful defense of Scotland's independence. Now, their expertise could be turned to a regeneration of Scotland's role as the heirs of the Maccabees who restored and purified their national Temple. The hint at egalitarianism—king and masons standing on the level—

²²² G. Patrick Edwards, "William Elphinstone, His College Chapel, and the Second of April," *Aberdeen University Review*, 51 (1985), 1–17.

²²³ The subject of his "Jewish extraction" remains controversial; see Helen Rosenau, *Vision of the Temple: The Image of the Temple of Jerusalem in Judaism and Christianity* (London: Oresko, 1979), 43–45.

²²⁴ G. Edwards, "Elphinstone," 9.

²²⁵ *Ibid.*, 9.

²²⁶ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 24.

expressed in the inscription at King's College reflected the reality of the spread of fine stonemasonry from the king's castles to the magnates' homes. Barrow and Royan point out "the emergence of even greater numbers of Scottish nobles into the stone-building classes from the late fourteenth century onwards."²²⁷ In 1498 the Spanish ambassador at the court of James IV recorded the singular fact that "the houses of Scotland are all good, all built of hewn stone."²²⁸ Significantly, at this time, there was very little building with stone in England, where wattle and wood construction was the rule for domestic housing. In 1503, when James IV married Margaret Tudor, daughter of the English king Henry VII, he not only initiated a brief period of peace but also of international cooperation between masons. A small number of English masons joined fellow craftsmen from France, and they helped the Scottish masons express in stone "the greatest flights of fancy" which seemed to "defy the nature of stone."²²⁹

Like the earls of St. Clair, James IV and Bishop Elphinstone combined masonic "flights of fancy" with fanciful excursions into the occult. While visualizing the Palace of Honor, their poetic spokesman Douglas also saw the "Nigromansie" of Guido Bonatti, a colleague of Michael Scot, and of Roger Bacon and his fellow magician Thomas Bungay.²³⁰ The St. Clairs accumulated volumes of Hermetic wisdom at Roslin and Orkney, and the king set up an alchemical lab in Elphinstone's lodgings for which he ordered Hermetic books.²³¹ At Stirling Castle, where his master masons were completing ambitious and "sumptuous" constructions, James established a laboratory for the eccentric alchemist John Damian, with whom he collaborated in chemical, medical, and mechanical experiments.²³² Though Damian failed in his attempt to fly from Stirling to France, the king maintained his faith in him.

From his readings in Duns Scotus, James assimilated the philosopher's vitalistic theories of "living stones," which drew on the Temple mysticism of Avicbron.²³³ While his notions of Solomonic kingship

²²⁷ Geoffrey Barrow and Ann Royan, "James Fifth Stewart of Scotland, 1260?-1309," in K. Stringer, *Essays*, 207n.40.

²²⁸ G. Stell, "Architecture," 161.

²²⁹ R. Fawcett, *Scottish Architecture*, 163.

²³⁰ G. Douglas, *Poems*, 109, 207.

²³¹ R. Mackie, *James IV*, 103, 158, 167.

²³² E. Holmyard, *Alchemy*, 218-21.

²³³ For his acquisition of Scotus's works, see James B. Paul, ed., *Compota Thesaurarium*

found masonic and magical expression, his “medievalizing romanticism” sought expression in a new crusade. An ardently religious monarch, who made pilgrimages on foot all over Scotland, James was determined to fulfill the frustrated wish of his ancestor Robert Bruce to reach the Holy Land.²³⁴ His ambition was shared by Bishop Elphinstone, who cherished the relics of crusaders and a rare volume on *De Passagio ad Terram Sanctam*, preserved in Aberdeen cathedral. The king and bishop were eager to solicit support from the Knights Hospitallers, who were currently using their base in Rhodes to fight the Turks. Thus, some unusual developments among the Hospitallers in Scotland—which suggest a clandestine survival of the Templars—became critical to James’s crusading plans.

Since 1488, Sir William Knolles, Preceptor of the Hospitallers at Torpichen, had continued to acquire Templar properties, until in 1507 he was recognized as “overlord of Templar lands.”²³⁵ In that year, the king sent Knolles gifts in recognition of his accomplishments. Then, in January 1508, James welcomed Knolles’s designated successor Sir George Dundas to his castle. After mastering Greek and Latin in Paris, Dundas had travelled to Rhodes, where he joined the Hospitallers and fought against the Turks. James eagerly questioned Dundas about conditions in the East, and he corresponded with the Grand Master at Rhodes. In order to reconnoitre the route for his planned journey, the king called on another churchman, Archbishop Blacader, who had supervised royal architectural projects at Glasgow. In February 1508 James sent Blacader on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, with instructions that the bishop should negotiate at Rome and Venice for the king’s crusade. Though James was distressed to learn of Blacader’s death in June, he continued to support Dundas. In October 1509, the Lords of the Council “expressly designated” Dundas as “Lord St. John when he was upholding the right of his Order to grant sanctuary in Temple lands in opposition to the action of the magistrates of Stirling.”

Did James IV undertake a revitalization of the Templars in order to utilize their strategies and strengths in a combined crusade with

Regum Scotorum: Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland (Edinburgh: General Register House, 1900), II, cxiii.

²³⁴ N. Macdougall, *James IV*, 196–222; A. Macquarrie, *Scotland*, 105–19.

²³⁵ Colin MacDonald, “The Struggle of George Dundas and His Rivals Patrick Panter, James Cortesius, and Alexander Stewart for the Preceptory of Torpichen,” *SHR*, 14 (1917), 23–26.

the Hospitallers? According to Mackie, James IV's first modern biographer, the king was "a moonstruck romantic, whose eyes were ever at the ends of the earth"; moreover, "he saw himself in the near future, leading a great fleet to the shores of Palestine, and then, at the head of the united forces of Christendom, advancing sword in hand, against the Turk."²³⁶ However, James's most recent biographer, Macdougall, argues that the crusading plans were not irrelevant or unrealistic, for the Turkish menace to eastern Europe was a real one.²³⁷ Moreover, the current peace between Scotland, England, and France meant there was real hope for a cooperative international expedition. However, James's plans foundered in his deteriorating relations with the aggressive new English king, Henry VIII.

After Knolles died in July 1510, James asked Henry VIII for a safe conduct for Dundas, the new Preceptor, and a party of Scottish knights to travel to Rhodes. However, by January 1511, James had learned that Dundas's appointment was made by the English contingent at Rhodes, who expected him to obey the English Prior at Clerkenwell. James then transferred the mastership of Torpichen to his secretary, Patrick Paniter, and protested the loss of independence for the Scottish Hospitallers. In April 1512 Paniter wrote to the Grand Master to complain about the actions of the English Prior, "his jeering adversary," and to promise to "revive the decayed endowments of the Order in Scotland."²³⁸ When the avaricious Pope Julius II unexpectedly appointed an Italian to the Scottish position, James refused to acknowledge him. The king was further angered when the English Cardinal of York persuaded the Pope to reject Paniter's claim. Ignoring the Pope's ruling, James wrote to the Grand Master at Rhodes in 1513, arguing that Scotland was often at war with England and that "Scotsmen promoted by English influence were objects of suspicion to him." Thus, he would admit no English superiority over Torpichen, "in imitation of his ancestors, who had always kept the English out of their kingdom."

Believing that he had preserved the uniquely Scottish Templar-Hospitallers, James IV determined to emulate his Bruce and Stewart forebears in the continuing struggle to maintain Scotland's political

²³⁶ R. Mackie, *James IV*, 201–02.

²³⁷ N. Macdougall, *James IV*, 202–03.

²³⁸ *Ibid.*, 33, 210, 283–310.

and religious independence. A popular and successful king, he encouraged Scotsmen to express their unique heritage—from Egypt, Judea, Spain, and Ireland—in masonic and magical works of architecture and alchemy. Like his seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Stuart heirs, he would see his crusading ideals founder on the rocks of English aggression. Excommunicated by a predatory Roman Pope and attacked by a hostile English king, this most popular Scottish king died on the battlefield of Flodden in 1513. However, so strong was the imprint of his Solomonic image that many believed that he did not perish. Instead, he left the destructive wars with England and made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem—where like the Maccabees and Robert Bruce, he was determined to purify and restore the Temple.

Fawcett observes that under James IV, “the Middle Ages passed into the age of the Renaissance on a triumphant note with the construction of a series of magnificent royal residences.”²³⁹ In these imaginative and innovative constructions, there was “a swaggering architectural expression of the claims of the Scottish monarchy on the wider European scene.” After the king’s death, his country entered a dangerous period in which the religious disputes of Europe ramified into Scotland. However, according to Scottish Masonic tradition, the Solomonic notion of kingship, the Temple mysticism of the Jews, and the chivalric idealism of the Templars and Hospitallers were preserved in Scotland throughout the difficulties of the sixteenth century, only to emerge in the organization of Stuart Freemasonry in the seventeenth century.

²³⁹ R. Fawcett, *Scottish Architecture*, 301.

CHAPTER THREE

REFORMATION OR DEFORMATION? MASONRY VERSUS THE “KNOCKING JACKS OF THE NORTH” (1513–1568)

Sometime after [the Crusades] our Order formed an intimate union with the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem. From that time, our Lodges took the name of Lodges of St. John. The union was made after the example set by the Israelites when they erected the second Temple, who, whilst they handled the trowel and mortar with one hand, in the other held the sword and buckler . . .

The fatal discords which embarrassed and tore Europe in the sixteenth century caused our Order to degenerate from the nobility of its origin.

—Andrew Michael Ramsay, speech to
Écossais lodge in Paris (1736)

Within two days, these great places, monuments of idolatry, . . . were so destroyed that the walls only did remain of all those great edifications.

—John Knox,
History of the Reformation in Scotland (1564)

Stunned by the disaster at Flodden, which destroyed their popular king and a generation of nobles and clerics, many Scots took refuge in accumulating legends about the pilgrimage of James IV, who searched for personal and national redemption. At the same time, the identification of Scottish independence with Stewart crusading ideals was threatened by the aggressive aims of Henry VIII, who was determined to make Scotland a satellite of England. Over the next six decades, Scottish rulers and nobles were buffeted by the winds of religious change, as the Protestant Reformation polarized the country and challenged traditional notions of national identification. Was Scotland to continue as a European country, loyal to a universalist Catholic church and international crusading ideals, or was the kingdom to become a subordinate territory within the newly Protestant “British” isles? This issue would ramify into the architectural and ritual world of the masonic lodges, where the sons of Solomon would see rival claimants for control of their northern Temple.

While Henry VIII's sister Margaret, the widowed queen of James IV, took control of the government in the name of her infant son James, Henry renewed his campaign to gain control over the Knights of St. John of the Hospital at Torpichen. Appointed "Protector of the Order" by the Pope in 1511, Henry turned the branch in Ireland into an instrument of English despotism, in which only complaisant knights from England were allowed to serve the Irish priory.¹ Unable to discharge Patrick Paniter from his position as royal secretary, Margaret and Henry attempted to exploit his opportunism in order to win him over to English interests. Thus, in May 1514, the English king wrote to Pope Leo X, urging him to recognize Paniter's claim to the mastership of Torpichen.² However, Paniter was not sufficiently malleable to Henry's will, and the king subsequently transferred his support to George Dundas. Henry then persuaded the Pope to recognize England's candidate. In May 1515 Leo X ordered the Scottish bishops to support Dundas, on pain of severe punishment. Complying further with Henry's strategy, Leo instructed his agent in Scotland to urge peace with England. Hypocritically appealing to the memory of the chivalric James IV, the agent preached that Scotland should "be no obstacle to a general expedition against the Turk," which will require "the unity of Christendom against enemies of the faith."

Alarmed by these developments, the Scottish patriotic party invited John Stewart, Duke of Albany (Aubigny) to come from France to serve as regent. When Albany arrived in Scotland in May 1515, he launched a vigorous defense of Scottish national interests against English incursions. Backed by France, the regent undertook an extensive building program of fortifications in expectation of invasions by Henry VIII. He ordered the nobles to strengthen their own residences, which resulted in the wide employment of military and domestic masons.³ In 1617 Albany and a party of Scottish lords returned to France, where they observed the great châteaux in the Loire valley, the premier Renaissance building-site in Europe. McKean suggests that they were presented to Leonardo da Vinci at Amboise and that his designs influenced the architectural work of Hamilton

¹ H. Sire, *Knights*, 182, 186.

² James V, *The Letters of James V*, ed. Denis Hay (Edinburgh: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1954), 1954), 17-23.

³ M. Glendinning, *History*, 16.

of Finnart on his return to Scotland.⁴ Macaulay stresses that “the brave insignia of Renaissance ornament, dating from the early sixteenth century,” which bedeck the royal palaces in Scotland, “pre-date any similar system of Renaissance designs in England.”⁵

During his nine-year regency, Albany’s architectural agenda was complicated by the continuing dispute over the Hospitallers’ priory at Torpichen. Two years before his arrival in Scotland, the Pope had named Albany’s brother, Alexander Stewart (member of the St. Clair family) as Prior in Scotland. Now Albany had to contend with the old claim by Paniter, whom he distrusted, as well as the recent appointment of Dundas. In letters to Rome, he argued Alexander Stewart’s right to the Torpichen post. By January 1517, with the English truce expiring, Albany wrote Pope Leo X to justify his opposition to Dundas, whom he considered an agent of the English. Arguing that “Torpichen has exceptional value in the eyes of the crown, and requires a loyal man who has always held place in council,” he accused Dundas of spying for Henry VIII and of waging war on his fellow Scots.⁶

Despite the continuing controversy, the Scottish Knights of St. John maintained their crusading idealism. After fighting at the siege of Rhodes, which ended with a Turkish victory in 1522, two Scots joined the defeated order of Hospitallers, while another Knight Hospitaller returned from the crusade to found a chapel in Scotland.⁷ In the meantime, Albany had come to terms with the pro-English party and allowed Dundas to assume command of Torpichen. The regent’s fears about English manipulation of the order were born out when Henry VIII, unmoved by the loss of Rhodes to the Turks, determined to divert the English Hospitallers to “the task of garrisoning Calais on the plea that they had nothing else to do.”⁸ By 1524 Dundas repaid Albany by repudiating his regency and making “at least an outward parade” of loyalty to the young Scottish king, James V.⁹

⁴ Charles McKean, “Sir James Hamilton of Finnart: a Renaissance Courtier-Architect,” *AH*, 42 (1999), 141–42.

⁵ James Macaulay, *The Classical Country House in Scotland, 1660–1800* (London: Faber and Faber, 1987), xxii.

⁶ James V, *Letters*, 38; C. MacDonald, “Struggle,” 45.

⁷ A. Macquarrie, *Scotland and Crusades*, 127.

⁸ H. Sire, *Knights*, 186.

⁹ C. MacDonald, “Struggle,” 47.

Though most historians have viewed this Scottish struggle for control of a crusading order as an eccentric anachronism, it was actually part of the burgeoning reform movement within French and Scottish Catholicism. Moreover, Scottish students in Paris were privy to a Lullist revival which emphasized the need for regeneration of the knightly orders through Lull's science of illumination. Significantly, the Lullists believed that Jewish esoteric lore provided the key to that science. The main transmitter of Cabalistic Lullism to the Scots was the brilliant French humanist Lefèvre d'Etaples (1455?–1536), who worked for decades with professors and students from the northern kingdom.

Lefèvre had been inspired by his studies in Italy with Pico della Mirandola to search out the mystical and scientific texts of the past.¹⁰ He was also impressed by Pico's collaboration with Jewish scholars, who convinced him that Cabalistic exegesis was invaluable for understanding scripture. With characteristic enthusiasm, Pico proclaimed:

There are no letters in the entire Law which do not show forth the secrets of the ten *sephiroth* in their forms, conjunctions and separations, curvature and directness, deficiency and superfluity, smallness, and largeness, their crowning, their closed and open form, and their arrangement.¹¹

He argued further that "there is no science which makes us more certain of the divinity of Christ than magic and cabala."

For Lefèvre, Pico's statement that Lullism was a form of Cabalism (an *ars combinatoria*) provided a key to the chivalric science that Lull's illuminated Hospitallers were supposed to disseminate. Returning to Paris, Lefèvre published Lull's works on the crusading orders, visionary techniques, and mystical mathematics. The latter subject, which was his favorite, spurred him to further investigation of the Cabalistic arts, which he merged with neo-Pythagorean and neo-Platonic theories. In his treatise *De Magia Naturali* (ca. 1495), Lefèvre made the first recorded reference to the Cabala in France.¹² Mastering the numerical-linguistic permutations of the *Sepher Yetzirah*, he also exper-

¹⁰ J. Hillgarth, *Ramon Lull*, 282–87; Augustin Renaudet, *Préréforme et Humanisme à Paris*, 2^{ème} ed. (Paris: Librairie d'Argences, MCMLIII), 378–79, 464, 661, 699.

¹¹ Joseph L. Blau, *The Christian Interpretation of the Cabala in the Renaissance* (New York: Columbia UP, 1944), 21–24.

¹² Eugene Rice, "The *De Magia Naturali* of Jacques Lefèvre d'Etaples," in Edward Mahoney, ed., *Philosophy and Humanism: Renaissance Essays in Honor of Paul Oskar Kristeller* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 27.

imented with the architectural visualizations involved in Jewish Temple mysticism. Like Lull, he seemed to incorporate these Cabalistic visionary techniques into a “masonic” world view, as suggested by a passage in *De Magia*:

Heaven imprints on the minds of those influenced by [the constellation] Pegasus a true outline of future events. Just as the architect, before he puts up a building, makes preparatory drawings from which he can visualize the structure that his fellow citizens will eventually see in reality, so heaven can instruct the eye of the mind to see past, present, and future.¹³

To supplement his publications of Lull, Lefèvre also produced new editions of Nicholas of Cusa (Lull’s most fervent disciple), Pythagoras, Euclid, Josephus, and Ficino’s *Pimander*. These projects fueled his campaign to revitalize mathematical instruction and research at the University of Paris, for he believed with Ficino that “a mathematical *modus philosophandi*” had been propagated by Hermes Trismegistus, Zoroaster, Pythagoras, the Egyptian *magi*, Plato, and the Cabalists. For Lefèvre, this philosophy and the means of its transmission was most clearly defined by Lull and his followers, who so Christianized the Jewish and pagan elements that the *Ars Magna* became acceptable to the medieval church. When Lefèvre succeeded in establishing a chair of Lullist studies at the Sorbonne, he legitimized this essentially Cabalistic science as an area of Catholic inquiry.

During these heady years of syncretistic reform, Lefèvre was assisted by his Scottish colleagues and students, who shared their master’s sense that Lullian science provided an important link between the best of medieval thought and the Renaissance revival of classical learning.¹⁴ Lefèvre’s Lullist influence on the Scots in Paris provided an important countermovement to Erasmus’s classical influence—though many Scots did not see the two movements as contradictory. James IV had employed Erasmus as tutor to his natural son Alexander Stewart, and the two made a study tour of “the latest fashions in architecture” in Italy.¹⁵ John Major, a Scottish Master of Arts in Paris, admired the New Testament scholarship of Erasmus, but he disagreed with the latter’s scorn for “gothic barbarities.” Though Major was an expert in scholastic philosophy, he published a defense

¹³ Ibid., 23.

¹⁴ A. Renaudet, *Préréforme*, 274–75, 464–65, 656, 658.

¹⁵ M. Glendinning, *History*, 10.

of Pico in 1509, in which he praised the Christian Cabalist for retaining respect for medieval traditions while exploring new humanist fields. The work was dedicated to Alexander Stewart, who now served as Bishop of St. Andrews, where he undertook architectural expansions that merged Gothic and Renaissance features.

Another Scottish student and brilliant humanist, George Buchanan, admired Erasmus but also Lefèvre, whom he praised for his services to letters and for “bringing light out of darkness.”¹⁶ Because of Erasmus’s commitment to the “enlightened” classical works of Greece and Rome, he distrusted the growing enthusiasm for Hebrew and Cabalistic studies. In 1514 Lefèvre’s circle supported Johannes Reuchlin, the great German Hebraist and student of Pico, when he was persecuted for publishing Cabalistic works. Though Erasmus disliked the persecution of any scholar, he was ambiguous in his response to Reuchlin’s publications and plight. “Talmud, Cabala, Tetragrammaton, Gates of Light, these are but empty names,” complained Erasmus; “I would rather see Christ infected by Scotus than by that rubbish.”¹⁷ Erasmus especially opposed the emphasis on Jewish ceremonial and ritual in Reuchlin’s works, *De Verbo Mirifico* (1494) and *De Arte Cabalistica* (1517), which he believed counterproductive to the needed reform of the church. Even worse for Erasmus was the appearance of the pseudo-Lullian work, *De Auditu Cabalistico* (1518), which represented Lull as a Cabalist and alchemist. For Lefèvre, who had drawn on Reuchlin’s *De Verbo Mirifico* in his treatise on natural magic, the German’s works were contributions to the Lullist revival of mathematics and science.

These two strains of humanistic teaching—one syncretic and magical and the other classical and rationalist—would eventually influence the differing political beliefs of Parisian-trained Scots, when they struggled for national survival in the decades ahead. As we shall see, Reuchlin’s “wonder-working Word” would become assimilated into the Cabalistic traditions long maintained by Scottish masons, while they continued to support the Stewart dynasty during the dangerous periods of repeated English invasions.¹⁸ Unlike Lefèvre, who pub-

¹⁶ P. Hume Brown, *George Buchanan: Humanist and Reformer* (Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1890), 18; I.D. Macfarlane, *Buchanan* (London: Duckworth, 1981), 4–5, 40–41.

¹⁷ G. Lloyd Jones, introd., *Johann Reuchlin: On the Art of the Kabbalah*, trans. M. and S. Goodman (New York: Abaris, 1983), 25.

¹⁸ For Reuchlin’s influence on Scots-Irish Freemasonry, see P.G. Maxwell-Stuart,

lished Lull's appeals for the unification and regeneration of the Templars and Hospitallers, Erasmus opposed the crusading ideal as an outworn movement. He hoped to influence his Scottish friend Hector Boece, who revered George Dundas and praised his efforts to gain control of Torpichen. In Boece's *Lives of the Bishops* (Paris, 1522), he noted that Dundas outdistanced all rivals, by great efforts, and obtained the position of Master of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem in Scotland.¹⁹ He also praised Dundas's scholarly history of the order. However, in his *History of Scotland* (Paris, 1527), Boece minimized the role of crusading idealism in recent Scottish history. Erasmus was so encouraged by this change in Boece's attitude that he sent him his criticism of warfare against the Turk in 1529.²⁰

While Erasmus and his circle expressed their diminishing confidence in chivalric ideals, the young James V maintained his family's interest in the crusades. He was greatly impressed by the heroic tales and miraculous relics brought back to Scotland by veterans of the Hospitaller defense of Rhodes—despite the mockery by radical reformers who dismissed the relics as fraudulent.²¹ Some of these magical charm stones had been produced by Jewish artisans on Rhodes, who had assisted the knights in their struggle. In 1530, when the Emperor Charles V gave the island of Malta to the Hospitallers, he ushered in "a period of comparative toleration" for the Jews, who were allowed to settle in Malta by permission of the Grand Master.²² As the knights undertook ambitious stone construction projects, they were often assisted by their Jewish allies.

During this period, James V also observed the cynical exploitation of the Hospitallers by Henry VIII, who attempted to use the knights against his French enemies and who extracted enormous payments for their "privilege" of residence in Hospitaller priories in England.²³ In order to avoid a repetition of the struggle for Torpichen, the Scottish king allowed the Grand Master to appoint Dundas's nephew, Sir Walter Lindsay, as preceptor-designate.²⁴ Lindsay had

"De Verbo Mirifico: Johannes Reuchlin and the Royal Arch," *AQC*, 99 (1986), 206–09.

¹⁹ Hector Boece, *Murthlacensium*, 88, 160n.88.

²⁰ A. Macquarrie, *Scotland and Crusades*, 113.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 127.

²² Cecil Roth, "The Jews of Malta," *TJHSE*, 12 (1928–31), 242.

²³ H. Sire, *Knights*, 186.

²⁴ C. MacDonald, "Struggle," 47–48.

often fought against the Turks, and his chivalric *virtù* won him great favor from James.²⁵ His succession to Torpichen in 1532 reinforced the Stewart king's enduring respect for the crusading ideal.

In 1534 developments south of the border took a dangerous turn for Scotland. Determined to obtain a divorce, Henry VIII asserted his supremacy over the national church and broke with the Papacy—thus launching the Protestant Reformation in England. (I will henceforth distinguish between the Protestants and the reformers within the Catholic church by using a capital “R” for Protestant Reformers). James V's reassertion of Scottish control and Papal support of Torpichen irritated an English king determined to consolidate his defiant position. Hoping to win Scottish backing for his break with Rome, Henry tried to flatter James V by nominating him for the Order of the Garter, an honor which the Scottish king somewhat reluctantly accepted in January 1535. However, Henry's execution of Sir Thomas More in July tarnished the lustre of his chivalric fraternity, and James V remained loyal to the Pope.

In 1537 a nationalistic Scottish friar, Adam Abell, who feared the English Reformers as much as the English soldiers, protested the decline of Scottish patriotism and chivalry. Harking back to earlier crusaders, Abell lamented:

Oh how great zeal had the Christian men of that time, in regard of them as now is in the isle of Britain, that nought for faith nor justice will fight, but give them all to covetous and carnal life! Where are the noble men that were wont to defend the borders? All are now to seek; but there are many fostered, instructed [“fosteraris of thewis”] as false colleagues of the Englishmen.²⁶

Though Boece minimized the crusading ideal as central to Scotland's destiny, he emphasized the architectural ideal as an expression of ancient independence and dynastic continuity. His detailed descriptions of the masonic labors of earlier kings and bishops have already been noted, and he must have been pleased that James V continued the tradition of standing “on the level” with his masons. While directing a major architectural program, especially at the royal residences, James V combined a humanist classical vocabulary with his father's “medievalizing romanticism.”²⁷ At the same time in England,

²⁵ Lord Alexander Lindsay, *Lives of the Lindsays* (Wigan: C.S. Simms, 1840), I, 143.

²⁶ A. Macquarrie, *Scotland and Crusades*, 114. I have modernized the spelling.

²⁷ R. Fawcett, *Scottish Architecture*, 320–30.

Henry VIII abandoned his earlier architectural ambitions and unleashed an iconoclastic rampage against "Papist" buildings.

Colvin argues that Henry's dissolution of the monasteries was the greatest single act of architectural vandalism in English, perhaps even European, history:

... in England between 1536 and 1540 every monastery was dissolved in a country whose culture had for five hundred years been largely embodied in its churches and religious houses, and the great majority of their buildings were ... "plucked down" or "defaced." This was done by the authority of a grasping and tyrannical king, and effected by his minister, Thomas Cromwell, through subordinates who were for the most part ruthless, cynical and philistine men.²⁸

Girouard argues further that Henry's break with Rome led to disruption of England's contacts with artistic developments on the Continent:

... the Crown abandoned almost entirely the role of patron of the arts. By two sharp blows English architecture had lost its main supporters and the main links which would have connected it with the architecture of the Continent. For fifty years it remained provincial, a backwater in which there were only faint or distorted echoes of developments over the Channel.²⁹

Pursuing an opposite policy, James V strengthened Scotland's links with European architectural developments. When he first contemplated a French marriage in 1634, he called upon Hamilton of Finnart—who made several study tours in France—to reconstruct Linlithgow Palace for his new bride. Finnart then took up a pioneering role, in which he functioned more like a Vitruvian architect than a medieval Master of Works or master mason. He worked closely with the king, who was determined "to use architecture as one of the principal symbolic activities of his reign."³⁰ The two men collaborated on designs and instructions for masons working on the royal palaces.

The chronicler Lindsay praised James's international outreach, for the king "plenished the country with all kinds of craftsmen out of

²⁸ Howard Colvin, "Recycling the Monasteries: Demolition and Re-use by the Tudor Government, 1536–47," in his *Essays on English Architectural History* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1999), 52.

²⁹ Robert Girouard, *Robert Smythson and the Elizabethan Country House* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1983), 3.

³⁰ C. McKean, "Hamilton of Finnart," 145, 151, 166.

other countries, as Frenchmen, Spaniards, Dutch men, and Englishmen which were all cunning craftsmen, every man for his own hand," in order to "apparel his palaces."³¹ South of the border, Henry VIII was no longer able to attract first-rank architects and masons from the Continent, for the best Catholic craftsmen were "unlikely to risk Papal disapproval by coming to England."³² James was so impressed with the Renaissance designs and technical expertise of the French masons that he appointed one, Thomas French, as master mason to the king in 1535.³³ French's son subsequently worked on the cathedral at Aberdeen and built a fine bridge of seven arches over the neighboring Dee.

In 1537, in preparation for his marriage to Madeleine of Valois, eldest daughter of François I, James appointed John Scrymgeour of Myres as Master of Works to oversee repairs to Holyrood and Falkland palaces. Significantly, Scrymgeour was an expert on heraldry, and in the year of his architectural appointment he prepared a transcript of Gilbert Hay's translation of Lull's Book of Knighthood.³⁴ As in the glory days of St. Clair building at Roslin Church, when Hay made the translation, Lull's ideal of illuminated knighthood was associated with significant masonic enterprises. Working with Scrymgeour at Holyrood was John Aytoun, master mason, whose family would continue to provide masonic service to the Stewart kings until 1638.

When James V brought his new French bride to Scotland, they were accompanied by a French master mason, Moses (or Mogyne) Martyne, who was earlier employed at Dunbar.³⁵ The unusual forename of Moses, which was passed on to Martyne's son, suggests a possible Hebraic or Marranist background for the master mason. After Queen Madeleine's death and James's return to France for a second marriage with Mary of Guise, the king travelled with Martyne and studied the Renaissance features of the palaces built for François I. His new in-laws, the powerful Guise family, were great builders, and James asked their assistance in recruiting talented masons to

³¹ Robert Lindsay of Pittscottie, *A History of the Stuart Kings of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1778), 252.

³² M. Girouard, *Smythson*, 3.

³³ [J. Robertson], ed., *Inventaires de la Royne Descosse Douairiere de France* (Edinburgh: Scottish Texts Society, 1863), lxi–lxii.

³⁴ M. Glendinning, *History*, 17.

³⁵ R. Mylne, *Master Masons*, lxii, 42.

Scotland. In summer 1539 the Duchess of Guise reported to her daughter, the new queen of Scotland, that six French masons were on their way to Edinburgh. Queen Mary then took an active interest in royal architectural projects. As we shall see, the masonic ties between the Scottish monarchy and the Guise family would later have important political significance. In the meantime, for James V, the combination of medieval and Renaissance features in his architectural projects reflected his determination to maintain Scotland's traditional alliances with Rome and France—in the face of Protestant pressure and English hostility.

On his return to Scotland, James V asked George Buchanan to act as tutor to one of his natural sons, Lord James Stewart.³⁶ The appointment brought Buchanan, an admirer of the Lullist revival in Paris, into contact with the king and his friends, who included many of the masons and craftsmen engaged on royal projects. Buchanan probably learned that the Master of Works made a transcript of Lull's chivalric work and that the king was a student of Lullist alchemy. At this time, James recruited foreign alchemists to help develop Scotland's mining and metallurgical industries.³⁷ He was intrigued by the "peculiar rules which ought to be strictly observed" when alchemists train apprentices to the craft. In the eighteenth century, when *Écossais* Freemasons developed rituals modeled on the stages of training in alchemy, did they draw on earlier Scottish traditions?

Buchanan also shared with James his knowledge about Jewish customs (*à la Lefèvre*), and rumors circulated that Buchanan persuaded the king to join him in an act of deliberate Judaizing. Catholic apologists later claimed that Buchanan urged the king to "eat the paschal lamb if you wish to achieve salvation."³⁸ When the scholastic theologian John Major was consulted, he warned James that "whoever says that you should eat the paschal lamb, he would wish you to become a Jew and live as Jews do." Though the case remains obscure, Williamson suggests that Buchanan absorbed an interest in Jewish lore from the Portuguese "New Christians" (converted Jews), who studied with him at the College of Sainte Barbe in Paris (ca. 1525–34).³⁹

³⁶ Hume Brown, *Buchanan*, 91.

³⁷ James V, *Letters*, 129.

³⁸ John Durkan, "Buchanan's Judaizing Practices," *Innes Review*, 15 (1964), 186–87.

³⁹ Arthur Williamson, "British Israel and Roman Britain: The Jews and Scottish Models of Polity from George Buchanan to Samuel Rutherford," in R.H. Popkin

Despite his immersion in Graeco-Roman classicism and ostensible separation from Hebraic traditions, Buchanan's thought "took its earliest form in a deeply, if ambiguously, Judaized environment." Another student at St. Barbe, Guillaume Postel, progressed from admiration of Lull and Lefèvre to the production of scholarly translations of the *Sepher Yetzirah* and *Zohar*.⁴⁰

Given the Scottish king's interest in alchemy and association with masons, who maintained Solomonic traditions, Buchanan may have assumed that James V was curious about Jewish beliefs and rituals. Despite royal patronage, Buchanan was arrested on heresy charges in 1538, but he managed to escape—supposedly with the connivance of the king who hoped to use him as a secret agent in England, where he could pass as a religious refugee. To gain the favor of Henry VIII, whom he previously despised, Buchanan wrote an obsequious eulogy in which he praised the English king's attacks upon the monasteries.⁴¹ This architectural destruction was obviously anathema to James, who prided himself on Scotland's continuing masonic enterprises, but Buchanan's praise of Henry's policy would give him credibility as a refugee from the architecturally-minded "Papist" king.

Shortly after Buchanan fled Scotland, James expressed his devotion to Henry St. Clair, dean of Glasgow and member of the famous masonic family, whom he described as "very serviceable in the intimate affairs of the royal court."⁴² In 1541 the king wrote the Pope to request the appointment of St. Clair, "who comes from the ancient and distinguished house of the Orkneys," to the abbey of Kilwinning. It was probably at this time that the tradition emerged that the St. Clairs, as hereditary Grand Masters, "held their head court (or in Mason style) assembled their Grand Lodge at Kilwinning, . . . where it is presumed Masons first began in Scotland to hold regular and stated lodges."⁴³ Later, in 1550, when Buchanan was charged by the Portuguese Inquisition with Judaizing heresies, Henry St. Clair came to his defense, based on his earlier friendship with the scholar in Scotland.

and G.M. Weiner, eds., *Jewish Christians and Christian Jews* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1994), 98–105.

⁴⁰ Marion Kuntz, *Guillaume Postel* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1981), 13–14, 44, 65, 84, 87.

⁴¹ I. McFarlane, *Buchanan*, 72–75.

⁴² James V, *Letters*, 419, 541.

⁴³ [Auld], *Freemason's Pocket Companion*, 112–13.

In 1539 James elevated Hamilton of Finnart to a new position as “Master of Work principal to our Sovereign Lord of all his works within the realm now built and to be built.”⁴⁴ He thus enabled the powerful but insecure noble (whose illegitimacy gave him the title “James the Bastard”) to substitute architectural for his former political authority. Though James counted on Finnart’s mastery of artillery fortifications to thwart the aggressive aims of Henry VIII, he and his Master of Work made the spectacular Stirling Castle an emblem of peace and plenty, “eschewing all militaristic and heraldic overtones in favour of a paean to Renaissance humanism.”⁴⁵ In one carved stone tableau, the iconography “represents the Sun God, invoking his protection for the king.” Behind the sculptures, “the ashlar is amongst the finest stonework ever seen in Scotland, so close-jointed that even after 450 years of windy exposure, there is virtually no weathering.” Even more striking was Finnart’s ability to “plan in three dimensions *a priori*,” which raises the question of whether Lull’s Art of Memory, with its techniques of geometric and architectural visualization, was utilized by the king’s designer. In 1599, when another royal architect required training in “the art and science of memory” for masonic craftsmen, he possibly drew on earlier Scottish traditions.

James V entrusted Finnart with important affairs of state, and the courtier-architect became a powerful figure in Scottish governance.⁴⁶ In January 1540 the king reaffirmed Hamilton’s position, granting the architect and his craftsmen “unlimited access for devising, building, or mending” royal edifices. Then, to the amazement of contemporaries and later chroniclers, Finnart was suddenly arrested in July. Though some historians suggest that “James the Bastard” was the victim of internecine revenge within the Hamilton family, McKean suspects that he succumbed to “a Protestant ambush,” for several notable Reformers contributed to his downfall.⁴⁷ Perhaps Henry VIII, who earlier provided a secret pension to the youthful Finnart, now achieved revenge on the king’s architect through his agents in Scotland. Bishop Lesley reported that Finnart was unconcerned by his arrest,

⁴⁴ M. Glendinning, *History*, 17–18. Modernized spelling.

⁴⁵ C. McKean, “Hamilton of Finnart,” 159–64.

⁴⁶ R. Fawcett, *Scottish Architecture*, 290, 326–27; Jamie Cameron, *James V: The Personal Role*, ed. Norman Macdougall (Phantassie: Tuckwell, 1998), 191–227.

⁴⁷ C. McKean, “Hamilton of Finnart,” 144–45, 170n.34.

... believing assuredly that he had been so diligent in the King's service, especially in reforming the palaces of Stirling and Linlithgow, and making new lodgings thereunto, so tenderly beloved and familiarly treated with the king, that therethrough he had no cause to fear.⁴⁸

However, Hamilton's accusers played upon James's fear of conspiracy and won his acquiescence in their toppling of his former favorite, who was executed in August. Hamilton's role as "architect for the greatest and most prolific of all Scots building monarchs" made his downfall "a wonder of the age."⁴⁹ For masonic history, it signalled the beginning of a destructive period of political turbulence, religious hostilities, and architectural neglect. The radical Reformer John Knox claimed that Hamilton's ghost appeared to the king in a dream vision, in which he struck off James's arms with his sword, crying: "Take that while thou receive a final payment for all thy unpiety."⁵⁰ This unhappy end to such a fruitful masonic collaboration points to the increasing polarization of Scotland, as the religious battles of England and Europe spread to the north.

Donaldson observes that allegiance to the monarch was one of the few features in Scottish life which over-rode the many divisions in the country:

The monarchy was sustained by attachment to a long and largely mythical line of "Scottish kings," who already in 1320 were said to have numbered one hundred and thirteen. But the belief was not in the inviolable rights of one particular family; it was in the inviolate independence of the kingdom.⁵¹

At the same time, Scotland was a more egalitarian country than England, and the notion of speaking freely to the king and nobles—of standing "on the level" with fellow patriots—was a time-honored tradition. Thus, "the Scot could combine his lack of class-consciousness with a sincere respect for the representatives of the ancient noble houses."⁵² The links of kin, the bond of manrent, and hereditary service gave cohesion to the whole nation. Parties could be freely formed,

⁴⁸ Ibid., 167.

⁴⁹ Charles McKean, "Hamilton of Finnart," *History Today* (January 1993), 42–47.

⁵⁰ John Knox, *John Knox's History of the Reformation in Scotland*, ed. W.C. Dickinson (New York: Philosophical Library, 1950), I, 28–29.

⁵¹ Gordon Donaldson, *Scotland: James V to James VII* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1965), 3.

⁵² Ibid., 14–15.

“often by the drawing up of formal bonds pledging the signatories to act in concert.”

Cuddy notes that Scottish egalitarianism within a royalist system was reinforced by similar patterns within the sixteenth-century French court. Moreover, the visiting French masons influenced their Scottish co-workers to embody “the system of free and open access” between subjects and king in the architecture of the royal residences:

The palaces of Falkland and Stirling were built by French masons, and the particularly close coming together of the “auld alliance” under James V in the early sixteenth century was probably instrumental in bringing about the full transfer of the system.⁵³

In contrast, English palaces were designed to preserve and manipulate the distance between the subject and the king. These differences of national temperament and royalist architecture were noted by foreign visitors to both kingdoms, and they would later make the accession of the Scottish king James VI to the English throne a difficult transition.⁵⁴

After the death of Finnart, increasingly serious threats to Stewart-masonic enterprises came from the English king, who was determined that James V would join his attacks on the Papist church. When James refused, Henry VIII began amassing troops for an invasion of Scotland in 1542, which prompted the Scottish prelates to offer financial and military support for a holy war against the English heretics. James then appointed Cardinal Beaton and Sir Oliver St. Clair as commanders of the troops, but they were not informed of his plan to make a pre-emptive invasion of England until the day of battle. According to the hostile account of the Protestant agitator Knox, the Papist St. Clair was so arrogant that he suddenly unfurled James V’s banner and commanded the troops “to obey him as the King’s person,” which startled and confused the recruits. The English then took advantage of the situation and made a sudden attack, in which St. Clair was captured:

⁵³ Neil Cuddy, “The Revival of the Entourage: the Bedchamber of James I, 1603–1625,” in David Starkey, ed., *The English Court: from the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War* (London: Longmans, 1987), 180.

⁵⁴ David Stevenson, “The English Devil of Keeping State: Élite Manners and the Downfall of Charles I in Scotland,” in Roger Mason and Norman Macdougall, *People and Power in Scotland: Essays in Honour of T.C. Smout* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1992), 126–44.

Stout Oliver was without a stroke taken, flying full manfully, and so was his glory suddenly turn'd to confusion and shame. The certain knowledge of his discomfiture comeing to the King's ears, . . . he was stricken with a sudden fear, so went he to bed, but rose without rest or quiet sleep. His continuall complaint was, O fled Oliver, is Oliver taken, O fled Oliver,—and these words in his melancholy, and, as it were caried in a trance, repeated he . . . to the very howre of his death. Fie fled Oliver, is Oliver taken, all is lost.⁵⁵

A shared interest in architecture and chivalry had made Oliver St. Clair a favorite of the king and thus a target of Knox's scorn. Though the king actually died from disease, Knox's falsified account was spread by the radical Reformers. His hostility would subsequently be applied to the royal masons, who long retained their loyalty to the Catholic monarchy and St. Clair family in the face of increasing Protestant pressure. With the death of James V in 1542, Scotland entered an eighteen-year period of turmoil and war with England, which caused a virtual halt to substantial building works:

Finnart's death may therefore be taken to symbolise the end of a short but incredibly intensive period of glorious royal and noble constructions, in which it had been the intention of Scotland to earn its place upon the European stage as much by architecture as it had by arms.⁵⁶

James V's death also resulted in a disruption within Scottish governance, as a series of regents and queens in Scotland and England struggled with the turbulent changes of the Reformation.

The late king's infant daughter Mary Stewart was immediately declared successor, while her mother Mary of Guise contended with rival claims to the regency. By 1544 the queen mother acted as *de facto* ruler under the vacillating regent Arran, half-brother of the executed Finnart, and opposing parties jockeyed for influence on foreign policy. Encouraged by Protestant Reformers in England, some Scots hoped for a peaceful alliance with their southern neighbor. Others were determined to maintain the traditional ties with France, where the Guise family exercised great influence at court. Worried by the inroads of the Anglophile party in Scotland, Mary of Guise utilized the Knights of St. John in support of her Francophile policies. Her brother François, Duke of Guise, currently served as Grand Prior of the French *langue* of the order.

⁵⁵ J. Knox, *History*, I, 25.

⁵⁶ C. McKean, "Finnart," *History Today*, 47.

Like her family in France, who employed outstanding architects and masons in their great building projects, Mary of Guise took an active interest in royal architecture, and she imported masons from France to Scotland. That the Guises were often compared to the Maccabees, because of their “feeling of blood brotherhood” and devotion to sacred architecture, gave them an unusual affinity with the Maccabean-chivalric-masonic traditions in Scotland.⁵⁷ Thus, during the dangerous days of Mary Stewart’s minority, this tradition survived in France and Scotland, at the same time that it underwent a hostile attack in England.

In 1540, two years before James V’s death, Henry VIII had confiscated the property of the Hospitallers in England and Ireland. However, he was surprised at the resistance made by the knights at Clerkenwell to his anti-Papal policies, for his “rapacity” had been meekly accepted by his placemen in Ireland. The later Stuart historian Thomas Fuller admired the London knights’ defiance at efforts to “reform” them:

The Knights Hospitaller, being gentlemen and soldiers of ancient families and high spirits, would not be brought to present to Henry VIII such puling petitions and public recognition of their errors as other Orders had done.⁵⁸

During the same period when Henry ordered the execution of three Knights of St. John, James V increased his support of the order. He sent a Scottish knight, Sir James Sandilands, to Malta, where the Hospitallers had moved their headquarters after the Turkish capture of Rhodes. Sandilands’ mission was to ensure “the provision of Torpichen.”⁵⁹ The continuing loyalty of the Hospitallers to the Scottish crown would become increasingly important as relations with England became more bitter and violent.

In 1544 Henry VIII launched the policy of “Rough Wooing,” in which English armies implemented a scorched-earth policy in Scotland, while they tried to force the kingdom into a Protestant alliance. Mary of Guise called upon the royal masons, led by her Master of Works John Milburn, to strengthen the castles at Edinburgh, Dunbar, and

⁵⁷ Antonia Fraser, *Mary Queen of Scots* (1969; New York: Dell, 1971), 65, 91.

⁵⁸ Quoted in H. Sire, *Knights*, 187.

⁵⁹ See account of Hospitallers in introduction to Robert Wedderburn, *The Complaynt of Scotland (c. 1550)*, ed. A.M. Stewart (Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society, 1979), liii n.44.

other vulnerable sites.⁶⁰ Milburn, who worked closely with the queen mother, was a Catholic clergyman who had to turn his attention away from ecclesiastical buildings to military fortifications. The masons currently employed on royal architectural projects must have been shocked at the English destruction of the great Gothic buildings. During the burning of Edinburgh, the abbey and palace of Holyrood were sacked. Also desecrated were the ancient tombs of Melrose Abbey, where Michael Scot and Robert Bruce lay buried.

Sharing the sense of architectural and masonic loss was James V's intimate friend, the Fourth Lord Seton, whose splendid castle and gardens were devastated. Since the days of his grandfather's friendship and architectural collaboration with the St. Clairs at Roslin, Seton's family had carried out ambitious architectural projects. His father, the Third Lord Seton, was a talented architect and, after his death at Flodden, his widow and son determined to carry on the family masonic tradition. Lady Janet Seton supervised innovative construction at Seton Palace and expressed her ardent faith by initiating important work on church buildings. In defiance of Protestant pressures, she founded prebendaries on properties of her own "conquest," which she obtained from "the Templar lands of Spenslands in East Fortune, and the Templar Lands of Seltone."⁶¹ The family's loyalty to the Roman church and the crusading orders provoked the anger of Henry VIII, and his agent Hertford deliberately devastated the Setons' properties, including the convent of St. Catherine of Siena outside Edinburgh "because Lady Seton was residing there." Through the troubled decades ahead, the Seton family remained staunch supporters of the Stewart dynasty and, in the next centuries, of Scottish Freemasonry. As Lady Seton tried to protect the Gothic churches on Templar lands, perhaps she too functioned as a guardian of the shadowy masonic "Order of the Temple."

While the pro-French Cardinal Beaton preached the need for a Scottish crusade against the English infidels, the pro-English Reformer Knox vented scorn on earlier crusaders, like Bishop Blacader, who made pilgrimages in the name of their "superstitious devotion to Jerusalem."⁶² In preparation for renewed English invasions, Beaton

⁶⁰ Henry Paton, *Accounts of the Masters of Works* (Edinburgh: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1957), I, xxvi.

⁶¹ G. Seton, *House*, 126–34.

⁶² J. Knox, *History*, I, 11, 76–77.

commissioned contingents of Scottish and French masons to re-fortify St. Andrews Castle. Significantly, he confidently assumed their loyalty to crown and church. However, Beaton's cruel persecution of Reformatist "heretics" exacerbated the religious divisions among the Scots. In June 1546 a group of Protestant lairds disguised themselves as the masons employed at the castle and murdered the cardinal. When the real masons attempted to capture the assassins, the latter took possession of the castle and determined to withstand the attack ordered by Mary of Guise. The royalists then utilized their military masons to undertake an extensive mining operation in an effort to re-take the castle.⁶³ During the prolonged siege, directed by the regent Arran, the medieval building suffered considerable damage.

After the death of Henry VIII in January 1547, the regent for his young successor Edward VI continued the "Rough Wooing" of Scotland. As the Scottish queen mother and her party resisted the English campaign, the Guise family appealed to the Grand Master of the Hospitallers at Malta, who then lent his support to Scotland. In April 1547 the surviving Catholic knights of the English *langue* elected the Scottish knight, Sir James Sandilands, to succeed the deceased Prior, Sir Walter Lindsay, at Torpichen.⁶⁴ Assuming that Sandilands shared the Catholic loyalties of the Hospitallers, Mary of Guise then included him in her political strategy. In May the Guises sent the captain of the Scots Guard, Jacques de Montgomery, to lead a French force against the rebels in St. Andrews, who were now called the "Castilians." After successfully reclaiming the castle in July, Mary, Montgomery, and her counsellors decided to launch a Franco-Scottish invasion of northern England. Though the English defeated a demoralized Scottish army at Pinkie in September, public opinion rallied to the queen mother and the French alliance.

Bolstered by her new popularity, Mary persuaded the council in November to explore a possible marriage between her young daughter and the French dauphin. In exchange France would defend Scotland against English invaders and English-supported Protestants. Determined to gain French backing for strict measures against the defeated Castilians, she instructed her Master of the Works, Hamilton of Milburn, to accompany the French ambassador to Paris, and she entrusted Hamilton with her most secret proposals. John Knox, who

⁶³ Fawcett, *Scottish Architecture*, 297.

⁶⁴ R. Wedderburn, *Complaynt*, x-xxiv.

was among the captured rebels, later wrote scornfully of this “masonic” messenger: “From Scotland was sent a famous clerk (laugh not, reader), Master John Hamilton of Milburn, with credit to the King of France, and unto the Cardinal of Lorraine.”⁶⁵ Hamilton was to ensure that the Castilians were “sharply handled,” and he won support for a crackdown on the radical Reformers.

However, while returning to Edinburgh, Hamilton met an accidental death at Dunbarton in May 1548—much to the delight of Knox, who recorded “so God took away a proud and ignorant enemy.” Knox also lamented that the letters from the French court were “forgot by the way” and never found. Perhaps Hamilton utilized the Art of Memory to carry his instructions in his head. Before his untimely death, the Master of Works had succeeded in his mission, and a French force landed in Scotland in June. Within a month, the Scottish Parliament agreed to the betrothal of Mary Stewart to the French crown prince and to the necessity of sending the child to France for a safe upbringing. When the six year-old queen sailed in August, she was escorted by a contingent of the Scots Guard, sent over by the French king. This project—negotiated by the Master of the Works and carried out by the Scots Guard—would feed eighteenth-century Masonic traditions that certain Jacobite lodges were “the lineal descendants of the Scottish Archers in attendance upon the King of France.”⁶⁶

The close collaboration between Mary of Guise and the Scottish masons contrasted starkly with the current situation in England, where Parliament passed acts in 1548 against the masons and other craftsmen who “conspire” to raise their wages.⁶⁷ Because of rapidly rising food prices and the loss of work after the dissolution of the monasteries, the living standard of masons in England declined precipitously over the next decade. Newly hewn stone was replaced by brick on major building projects, while so many Reformers stripped the stone off ecclesiastical buildings (for their private use) that many Gothic edifices simply disappeared.

While the queen mother tried to consolidate her gains, she became concerned about the “Trojan horse” of returning Scottish prisoners who had been pensioned by the English to secretly serve their cause.

⁶⁵ J. Knox, *History*, I, 97.

⁶⁶ R. Gould, *History*, III, 308.

⁶⁷ D. Knoop and G. Jones, *Genesis*, 207–08.

She turned again to the Knights Hospitaller for assistance in secret diplomatic and communication work. The seditious Knox was sentenced to the French galleys, which were commanded by her brother, the Grand Prior of France. Determined to accompany a party of loyal Scots nobles to France, she utilized the new Scottish Prior, James Sandilands, as her agent to arrange the visit.⁶⁸ To temporarily fill his position at Torpichen, Mary appointed the vicar of Dundee, Robert Wedderburn, to serve as chamberlain to the knights in July 1548. As part of her extensive propaganda campaign, she encouraged Wedderburn to use his tenure at Torpichen to compose *The Complaynt of Scotland*, a passionate argument for Scottish independence and the French alliance, which was replete with Maccabean, masonic, and crusader imagery.

The nineteenth-century editor of *The Complaynt* suggested that the merging of Hospitaller and masonic organization, as described by Chevalier Ramsay in 1736, took place at this time.⁶⁹ If true, the collaboration may explain Anderson's odd claim, made in 1738, that James Sandilands, "Knight of Malta," served as a Grand Master of the Scottish Freemasons.⁷⁰ Anderson was aware of Sandiland's later anti-French activities and, as a Hanoverian propagandist, he perhaps responded to Ramsay's Jacobite argument that the Scots Guard at the French court helped maintain the chivalric-Masonic tradition during the difficult days of the Reformation. Ramsay's assertion gains some plausibility from the Guise family's powerful presence at the court and Mary of Guise's use of the Scots Guard in various Franco-Scottish transactions.

In Wedderburn's tract, a startling number of masonic themes emerge, which give the poem an air of eighteenth-century "modernity." Wedderburn had studied in Paris in the 1530's, when Lefèvre, Buchanan, and the Lullists explored chivalric and Jewish lore. Traveling widely in Europe, he was exposed to Luther's teachings and sympathized with the need for reform. In 1539 both his brothers suffered persecution for their Protestant beliefs. However, Wedderburn also feared that the intensifying religious schisms were harmful to religion, and he advocated reform within the Catholic church. In many ways, he

⁶⁸ R. Wedderburn, *Complaynt*, xiv–xv.

⁶⁹ Leyden's Preliminary Dissertation to the *Complaynt of Scotland* (1812), pp. 67, 71; noted in A. Lawrie, *History*, 7–8.

⁷⁰ J. Anderson, *Constitutions* (1738), 91.

represented the most tolerant of French humanist attitudes, for he believed in a religious syncretism that drew on Hebrew, Egyptian, Greek, and Roman learning, in order to enrich a universalist Catholicism.

From the priory at Torpichen, Wedderburn conjured up memories of the golden days of chivalry, when Godfrey of Bouillon led a united Christendom in a great crusade against the infidels.⁷¹ That Godfrey was an ancestor of Mary of Guise made the allusion politically potent. As deliverer of the Holy Land, Godfrey achieved a “magnanimous, heroic, and martial enterprise,” while his brother Baldwin served ably as king of Jerusalem. Wedderburn traced the continuity of this crusading tradition in France, where the grandfather of Mary of Guise laid claim to the kingdom of Jerusalem.⁷² He then issued a nationalist call to arms for Scots, who should fulfill their own chivalric traditions in defense of their country against invading English infidels. Targeting the selfishness and arrogance of many Scottish nobles, he argued in Lullist terms that true nobility is not inherited but earned by honorable and courageous service to the commonwealth. The current orders of chivalry—the Cockle in France, Golden Fleece in the Empire, Garter in England—were all established to reward individual merit, not the accident of birth. However, all the orders need a Solomonic reform in order to regain the respect of men.

To achieve that reform, Scottish nobles and craftsmen needed to look to the Hebrew scriptures, which are replete with examples of chivalric endeavor. Like Mary of Guise, the great Jewish heroines Esther and Judith saved their people in dangerous times. Even more importantly, the Maccabees gave a stirring example of patriotism, when they refused to submit to foreign domination and desecration of their Temple. Evoking memories of the recent burning of Edinburgh, Wedderburn described the similar destruction of Jerusalem. Despite the temporary victories of their enemies, the Maccabees remained faithful to their traditions and drove the invaders out of Jerusalem. Then, they “reformed the destruction of the temple.”⁷³ Like the Jewish heroes, the Scottish patriots should “be zelators of the law of god” and “give your souls for the alliance of your fore fathers.” Curiously,

⁷¹ R. Wedderburn, *Complaynt*, 3, 116–22.

⁷² Rosalind Marshall, *Mary of Guise* (London: Collins, 1977), 15.

⁷³ R. Wedderburn, *Complaynt*, 59–60. Spelling modernized.

by the eighteenth century, the Cabalistic degree of "Zelator" would emerge in *Écossais* Freemasonry.⁷⁴

In his approach to history, Wedderburn utilized the Hebraic conceptions of Paul of Burgos, a Jewish convert who drew on the Talmud; in his approach to narrative, he imitated "the Hermetic use of actor and author as teacher, master of disciples, guru."⁷⁵ These two strategies were applied especially in Wedderburn's description of the two pillars built by Seth to preserve the world's knowledge in time of flood and fire. He elaborated the account in Josephus to include Hermetic and masonic accretions, which stressed the importance of mathematics, geometry, astronomy, and cosmography, whose secrets were engraved on the pillars. As a propagandist for Mary of Guise, Wedderburn may have received from her a copy of the first French edition of the *Corpus Hermeticum*, published in 1549 and dedicated to her brother, the Cardinal of Lorraine. Drawing on the syncretic Hermetic tradition, he referred to the magical roles of Hermes and Joseph in Egypt, when the latter taught the pharaoh the secrets of Jewish science. Like the Stewart monarchs, the outstanding Hebrew and Egyptian rulers all stressed the importance of the sciences and crafts to a nation's well-being. The Egyptian king Amasis, determined to cure the vice of idleness, ordered his people to "adhere to virtue, and to learn sciences, crafts, and mechanic occupations, most commodious and convenient for the public weal of Egypt."

Then, responding to Protestant criticism that his tenure at Torpichen made him an absentee vicar from Dundee, Wedderburn pleaded that his writing was as useful as the mechanic crafts. All the carpenters, smiths, and iron forgers should join with him to "serve for a hammer" against the Turks. Given the close relations of Mary of Guise with masons in France and Scotland, this allusion to the craftsmen's "hammer" would evoke memories of Charles Martel as well as Judas Maccabeus among the military and architectural masons. Wedderburn's appeal to patriotic craftsmen was reinforced by the queen mother's continued wooing of the artisan classes, which later included her attempt to gain the vote for them in burgh elections.⁷⁶

Wedderburn's usage of Jewish lore in his propaganda tract would find an increasingly receptive audience among young Scots, for many

⁷⁴ K. Mackenzie, *Royal Masonic*, 616, 776.

⁷⁵ R. Wedderburn, *Complaynt*, lvi-lvii, 36-37, 69.

⁷⁶ G. Donaldson, *Scotland*, 101.

were currently studying Hebrew in local grammar schools. As Hume Brown points out, Scotland had more primary and secondary schools than any other country in Europe, with the exception of the Netherlands: "Centuries before the Reformation, education was placed within the reach of all classes."⁷⁷ Moreover, since the 1540's, Hebrew was spoken as well as read in these schools, long before it became established in the universities.⁷⁸ Certainly, the Protestants' stress on reading the Old Testament encouraged Hebrew studies, but the reformist Catholics also brought home the fruits of their Jewish studies in Paris. The Catholic Wedderburn seemed to target a Scottish readership that was being led away from the French-Catholic alliance by Protestant emphasis on the Hebrew scriptures. The Reformers probably learned from English agents that in 1549 a converted Jew, John Immanuel Tremellius, was appointed professor of Hebrew at Cambridge, where he produced an important new translation of the Bible from Hebrew and Syriac into Latin—a translation designed to serve the Protestant cause.⁷⁹

The fiery Biblical harangues of the Protestants, who compared the Reformed church to the fighting Jews, so alarmed Catholic conservatives by 1550 that several Scottish scholars in Paris backed up the charges of the Portuguese Inquisition that George Buchanan, then teaching at the University of Coimbra, committed Judaizing heresies.⁸⁰ The Scottish Archbishop of Armaugh, who was visiting Paris, expanded the charge that Buchanan persuaded James V to eat the Paschal lamb to note that he had also "been the perdition of that youth," the "bastard son of the king." At this time, Buchanan was still a Catholic and represented the Hebraic interests of the reformers within the Papal church. Arguing that there were no Jews in Scotland and thus no Judaizing, he nevertheless revealed in his "sacred dramas" and other works his deep sympathy for Jewish heroic traditions.

⁷⁷ Hume Brown, *Buchanan*, 12.

⁷⁸ George Black, "The Beginnings of the Study of Hebrew in Scotland," in Louis Ginzburg, ed., *Studies in Jewish Bibliography* (New York: Alexander Kohut Memorial Fund, 1929), 463–78.

⁷⁹ "John Immanuel Tremellius," *DNB*; James VI, *The Poems of James VI of Scotland*, ed. James Craigie (Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1955), 315.

⁸⁰ J. Durkan, "Buchanan's Judaizing," 186–87.

In 1539–42 Buchanan had taught at the Collège de Guyenne in Bordeaux, where he became deeply involved in the Marrano culture of the area. As Williamson points out,

In France . . . Buchanan inhabited an environment which was not at all philo-Semitic, but was significantly crypto-Jewish. Publicly it normally appeared faultlessly Catholic—though many knew and still more suspected otherwise—while internally it was informed by elements of Jewish religion and identity.⁸¹

In Bordeaux Buchanan wrote two Latin tragedies which were performed by students at the College. The young Michel de Montaigne, whose mother came from a Marrano family, was one of the actors. Apparently intrigued by the dissembling role of his Marrano friends, Buchanan portrayed in *The Baptist or Calumny* a world of shifting appearances and reality in which the Jews emerge not as villains but as complex, ambivalent personages who struggle with challenges to their ancient laws by worthy reformers.

Buchanan's descriptions of the desecration of the Temple, once "the crown of Solomon's magnificence," revealed his familiarity with Josephus, Philo, and possibly Cabalistic sources:

. . . sadder far,
The hallowed courts trodden by feet profane,
And idol-symbols in the temple of God?
And I have seen the unentered Oracle
Profaned by gentile gaze.⁸²

Probably drawing on Reuchlin's *De Verbo Mirifico*, Buchanan described "The temple where the Highest doth record/ His name and dwelling-place."

When he defended his Catholic loyalty before the Inquisition, Buchanan argued that the tyrannical Herod in the play represented Henry VIII and the martyred John the Baptist represented Thomas More. In a second play, *Jephtah or the Vow*, Buchanan further suggested the identification of Scottish patriots with ancient Jews, who must remember the "covenant of old."⁸³ Buchanan's Jewish sympathies and Marranist friends rendered him suspicious to the Inquisition,

⁸¹ A. Williamson, "British Israel," 101.

⁸² George Buchanan, *The Sacred Dramas of George Buchanan*, trans. Archibald Brown (Edinburgh: James Thin, 1906), 94, 157–58.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 4–5, 31.

which instigated charges against him as a Judaizing heretic in 1548. That several Scottish colleagues in Paris supported the charges reflects the intensifying religious divisions in France and Scotland.

While the inquisitors in Paris continued their investigation of Buchanan, Mary of Guise arranged for the publication of Wedderburn's *Complaynt* in the French capital in mid-1550. Though she allowed Wedderburn to dedicate the work to her, she followed Sandilands' advice to keep the authorship anonymous in order to avoid confusion with Wedderburn's Protestant brothers.⁸⁴ At this time, the queen mother did not realize that her trusted agent Sandilands would soon function as a "Trojan horse," for after he returned with her from France in 1551 he began to secretly collaborate with Knox's party. Moreover, he began to covet Torpichen as a potential source of secular wealth and power. Unaware of his shifting loyalty, Mary of Guise sent a master mason to work on the churches at Torpichen.

With the young Mary Stewart safely in France, the regent Arran began to employ large numbers of masons in repair work on the damaged royal residences in order to make them suitable for the queen's eventual return. In his youth, Arran's interest in architecture was piqued by his half-brother and guardian, Hamilton of Finnart. This interest was shared by Arran's other half-brother, John Hamilton, now archbishop of St. Andrews, who directed the rebuilding of the castle which had been damaged by the mining operations of Arran's military masons.⁸⁵ As a discerning patron of architecture, the archbishop was determined to continue the ambitious programs of merged Gothic-Renaissance design espoused by James V.

However, the deteriorating health of the archbishop, who suffered severe asthma attacks, worried Mary of Guise, for she relied on his services in serious government affairs. Hamilton had been treated by a series of doctors recommended by the king of France and emperor of Austria, but nothing helped. Finally, he heard of the sensational cures achieved by Girolamo Cardano, a physician in Milan.⁸⁶ Cardano was also a brilliant mathematician, whose services as a military engineer and designer of fortifications were in demand in France; thus, he could provide valuable medical and masonic services to the Scottish

⁸⁴ R. Wedderburn, *Complaynt*, xviii-xix.

⁸⁵ R. Fawcett, *Scottish Architecture*, 280, 296, 330.

⁸⁶ On his experiences in Scotland, see Jerome Cardan, *The Book of My Life*, trans. Jean Stoner (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1930), 16, 97, 130, 299n.20.

court.⁸⁷ Encouraged by a large advance payment, Cardano set off for Scotland in February 1552. While treating the archbishop from June to September, Cardano also cured many nobles and earned the respect of Mary of Guise.

Her interest in the flamboyant doctor was increased by her enthusiasm for playing games of chance, for Cardano utilized his brilliant mathematical gifts to develop a scientific theory of gambling that became the "first attempt at a theory of probability."⁸⁸ Cardano's technique, which drew on a Cabalistic "calculus," would be employed by eighteenth-century Freemasons, such as Casanova, to predict the winning numbers in lotteries. Cardano was aided in his medical and mathematical breakthroughs by his mastery of the "Lullic Art."⁸⁹ Though the Lullist Art of Memory may already have been required for the training of masons, Cardano's expertise and contact with important patrons of masonry in Scotland—the queen mother, regent, and archbishop—was possibly a factor in its insitutionalization (as revealed by Masonic statutes in 1599).⁹⁰ Cardano later confessed that he owed everything that he knew to the Art of Memory.⁹¹

Like Lull, Cardano explored the mathematical and magical traditions of Christianity, Judaism, and Islam, and he expressed his intellectual tolerance by presenting the three religions side by side in his great encyclopedic work, *De Subtilitate* (1550).⁹² Like Lull, he also explored the mathematical theosophy of the Cabalists, which he utilized for his experiments in *ars combinatoria*. Even more striking was his Lullian belief that the Art provided a science of divination, through its methodical training of geometrical conceptualization, architectural visualization, and microcosmic interpretation. For the Scots, with their long tradition of "second sight" and dream interpretation, which were often utilized in political controversies, Cardano's

⁸⁷ J.V. Field and F.A. James, *Renaissance and Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993), 67.

⁸⁸ Mario Gliozzi, "Girolamo Cardano," C. Gillespie, *Dictionary*; Oystein Ore, *Cardano: The Gambling Scholar* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1953).

⁸⁹ Markus Fierz, *Girolamo Cardano, 1501–1576*, trans. Helga Niman (Boston: Burkhauser, 1983), 106–07.

⁹⁰ On the Schaw Statutes of 1599, see D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 49. Cardano's contribution to Masonic "science" was noted by the nineteenth-century *Écossais* Mason J.M. Ragon in his *De la Maçonnerie Occulte et de l'Initiation Hermétique*, rev. ed. Oswald Wirth (Paris: Émile Nourry, 1926), 66–67.

⁹¹ Frances Yates, *The French Academies of the Sixteenth Century* (London: Warburg Institute, 1947), 101n.3.

⁹² M. Fierz, *Cardano*, 8, 72.

learned explanations of the phenomenon must have been fascinating. In his apologetic autobiography, he downplayed the methodical training that allowed him to achieve divinatory dreams and telepathic visions, because he was afraid of being arrested as a heretical magician. However, his works and conversations made clear that the Lullian Art could be learned by anyone willing to train his memory and perceptions to a high pitch of alertness.

Cardano hinted that “its component parts are an ingeniously exercised employment of the intuitive faculty, and an accompanying lucidity of understanding”; moreover, “if it be not a divine endowment, it is certainly the most highly perfected faculty which a man may cultivate.”⁹³ The Art included the science of physiognomy, which “requires exceptional powers of memory and very ready perception, which can be learned through a long and most difficult course.” As noted earlier, the first translator of Lull into Scots English recommended the mastery of physiognomy to King James I. After describing his clairvoyant prediction of the defeat of the Knights Hospitallers on Rhodes, Cardano made an observation with particular relevance to Scotland: “those predictions are most reasonable which concern the development of the arts, such as the craftsman’s art.”

The claim made by Scottish Freemasons in 1638 that they possessed “second sight” has already been discussed. Moreover, this visionary capacity was connected with their possession of the Mason Word. That this expertise in clairvoyance and secret communication was connected with the Art of Memory is suggested by the requirement, recorded in 1599, that masons must be trained in the “art of memorie and science thair of.”⁹⁴ As we shall see, the formulator of that requirement was William Schaw, who allegedly served as a page to Mary of Guise. Schaw’s later commitment to the Art of Memory suggests a lingering influence from Cardano’s visit to the Scottish court. By briefly examining Cardano’s expertise in the Art of Memory which, according to his writings, drew on Cabalism, Lullism, and cryptography, we may gain some insight concerning the assimilation of its associated magical phenomenon into the lodges of operative stonemasons.

The phenomenon of “second sight” was the capacity of certain people to experience an intensely visual image of a future or distant

⁹³ G. Cardan, *Book*, 165, 168, 203.

⁹⁴ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 27, 49.

event. Though the gift was often possessed by simple peasants or artisans, it could also be cultivated by Cabalistic and Lullist meditation techniques. The Mason Word referred to the capacity of masons to secretly communicate with fellows over a long distance and to recognize “invisible” fellows in a crowd. Rooted in Jewish traditions of the unspeakable Tetragrammaton, the Mason Word combined practical identification purposes with Cabalistic number-letter mysticism. When Cardano practised the Art of Memory, he concentrated on the numerical-linguistic and architectural images advocated by the Cabalists and Lullists. By methodically intensifying these mental gymnastics and visualizations, he would achieve an “intuitive flash” that made the proper connections and analogies of all elements—natural and supernatural—vividly clear. From this insight, he could sometimes predict future events. Cardano also described his ability to receive auditory vibrations from far away, which would telepathically communicate information from unseen messengers.

Another masonic skill, the art of secret oral and written communication, may have received stimulus from Cardano. The capacity of masons to memorize complex historical and technical information was part of their guild secret. As noted earlier, the Master of Works to Mary of Guise may have relied on this enhanced memory capacity to carry secret messages from the French king. In the seventeenth century, politically active masons would also utilize invisible inks, trick papers, and secret codes for their correspondence. In all of these techniques, Cardano was an expert. He not only perfected the Art of Memory and the manufacture of “disassembling” inks and papers, but he gained insights into the nature of language from his studies in Cabala and Lull.

By manipulating every dot and tittle of letters and numbers, one could devise constantly changing ciphers. In his invention of the “Cardano Grille,” he provided the first autokey to complex codes.⁹⁵ By placing his grille (a sheet of stiff material into which rectangular holes have been punched) over a coded paper, the encipherer can write his message through certain holes that will then be hidden in the overt text. Cardano had worked on these techniques before coming to Scotland, and he subsequently published them in *De Rerum*

⁹⁵ David Kahn, *The Codebreakers: The Story of Secret Writing* (New York: Macmillan, 1967), 143–45.

Varietate (1556). These techniques of secret communication would later be utilized by Scottish Freemasons in the service of the exiled Stuart king, Charles II.

Though radical Protestants scorned Cardano as a "Papist magician," Mary of Guise continued to admire him and urged him to return to Scotland. That he was a magician did not bother her, for she shared the esoteric interests of the Guises in France, who patronized the publication of Hermetic literature and employed the astrological prophet Nostradamus on secret missions.⁹⁶ Cardano, who had met Nostradamus, was aware of the prophet's Jewish ancestry and of his boast that he inherited the predictive powers of the "tribe of Issacher."⁹⁷ Mary also knew that Cardano was no "Papist," in the sense of servile submission to the Vatican, but rather a liberal Catholic who like many intellectuals hoped for reform within the church. While Cardano disapproved of the persecution of Protestant "heretics," he perceived the Reformation party in Scotland as intolerant and prone to violence. Cardano's patient in Scotland, Archbishop Hamilton, seemed to express a more humane religious policy in his Catechism of 1552, which avoided reference to the Pope and called for moderate reforms within Catholicism.

When Mary of Guise became official regent in 1554, she too called for a policy of liberty of conscience. Hoping to recreate the more tolerant atmosphere of the early humanist era in Paris, she determined to endow royal lectureships that would train young Scots in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, thus leading to an increase in "cunning men" and "flourishing of letters."⁹⁸ Her appointed readers reflected her policy of moderation (all three later became prominent in the Reformed church) but, as Durkan notes, her "wider scheme, involving Hebrew and thus divinity, may have seemed too threatening to the existing universities." Despite their stress on reading the Old Testament, the Reformers resisted her effort to expand the teaching of Hebrew.

The regent Mary also hoped that improved education would enhance the material attractiveness of Scotland by encouraging "great decorating" in the arts and architecture. Probably encouraged by

⁹⁶ M. Baigent and R. Leigh, *Temple*, 154–55, 194.

⁹⁷ Harry Friedenwald, *The Jews and Medicine* (1944; New York: Ktav, 1967), I, 232, 246.

⁹⁸ John Durkan, "The Royal Lectureships Under Mary of Lorraine," *SHR*, 62 (1983), 73–78. Spelling modernized.

Cardano's stress on the importance of the Art of Memory to the improvement of artists and training of craftsmen, she and Archbishop Hamilton made a concerted effort to repair "the ruinous and dilapidated churches."⁹⁹ In March 1557 Mary appointed John Roytell, a Frenchman, as "principal master mason to all the queen's works."¹⁰⁰ That he had served as a burghess of Edinburgh since 1550 was consistent with her effort to raise the status of craftsmen. Mary's architectural restorations were part of her own reformist policy, as demonstrated by her sending an official letter to Rome (via her daughter) "asking the Pope to send a Cardinal to Scotland with the specific task of reforming the clergy."¹⁰¹ She described vividly the relaxation of ecclesiastical discipline and neglect of church buildings in Scotland, calling them "abuses which must be rectified."

For Cardano—and perhaps for the Scottish regent and archbishop—the reformation of the inner and outer church could be stimulated by Lullist science. Mary of Guise stayed in touch with Cardano after he left Scotland, and she possibly learned about his meeting in London with John Dee, the brilliant mathematician and astrologer, who would later serve as an intelligence agent for Queen Elizabeth.¹⁰² With Dee, Cardano examined a "celestially powered stone" similar to one he saw in Archbishop Hamilton's collection in Scotland. Mary definitely heard about Cardano's pleasant visit with the young Edward VI, for whom he predicted a long and happy life. When the English king died suddenly in 1553, Cardano's critics argued that it proved the failure of his Lullist science. Mary, who had also visited and admired the erudite and humane Edward VI, lamented his death but also hoped that the accession of the Catholic Mary Tudor to the English throne would slow down the momentum of the radical Reformers.

With Knox trying to woo James Sandilands, Prior of Torpichen, to the Protestant cause, the Scottish regent must have been pleased to see the new English queen reinstate the Hospitallers in Ireland in 1554 and England in 1557.¹⁰³ The resumption of Hospitaller

⁹⁹ George Hay, *The Architecture of Scottish Post-Reformation Churches* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1957), 18–19.

¹⁰⁰ J. Robertson, *Inventaires*, lxii.

¹⁰¹ R. Marshall, *Mary of Guise*, 202.

¹⁰² Anthony Grafton, *Cardano's Cosmos: The Worlds and Works of a Renaissance Astrologer* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1999), 112, 236n.18.

¹⁰³ H. Sire, *Knights*, 187.

loyalty to a Catholic monarch had been vividly demonstrated by Sir Thomas Tresham, new Prior of England, who had proclaimed Mary Tudor queen and provided escort for her march to London. In the meantime at Torpichen, James Sandilands learned that his preceptorship was being challenged by a kinsman, John James Sandilands, who had returned to Scotland from Malta in 1556. Though the motive for their quarrel is obscure, it is possible that John James learned of James's shift of loyalty from the Pope to the Protestant dissidents. After John James returned to Malta, his charges against James so incensed the latter that he travelled to the island to defend his claim in May 1557. His argument that John James did not possess sufficient nobility to be a knight was initially accepted by the Council.

However, in October the Grand Master "declared that both should appear before the provincial council at the Temple in Paris, so that brother James Sandelandis could prove his accusation, and brother John James could prove the contrary."¹⁰⁴ Given the secret collaboration of James Sandilands with pro-English Protestants, the order to appear at the Temple in Paris, where the brother of Mary of Guise served as Grand Prior, was obviously fraught with hazard. Fortunately for James, his kinsman requested leave to go instead to England and Scotland to procure proofs for his case, but the threat of war against the Turks led the Grand Master to insist that John James stay in Malta and "make his armament in the galleys for the tongue of England." The delay in the investigation brought valuable time for James Sandilands and his allies, the Protestant nobles and supporters of Knox.

Though the tolerant policies of Mary of Guise had brought a measure of peace among the religious factions in Scotland, the death of the Catholic Mary Tudor in 1558 added fire to the campaign of the Protestant radicals in both countries. The new English queen, Elizabeth I, was a Protestant with an insecure claim to the throne. Among her earliest acts was the suppression of the restored priories of the Hospitallers in Ireland and England. Sir Thomas Tresham, the Prior of England, was reportedly so shocked at Elizabeth's act that he went into a decline and died in March 1559.¹⁰⁵ As we shall see, Tresham's grandson would struggle to maintain the Catholic tra-

¹⁰⁴ I. Cowan, *Knights of St. John*, 185.

¹⁰⁵ H. Sire, *Knights*, 187.

ditions of the Hospitallers and masons under the hostile regime of the Protestant queen. Sir Richard Shelley, who had been active in the restoration of the Hospitallers and then became "Turcopolier," left England at Elizabeth's accession and entered the service of Philip II of Spain. The Shelley family remained Catholic until the eighteenth century, "and shortly after its apostasy produced in the poet Percy Bysshe Shelley its most famous member."

While Elizabeth I suppressed the Hospitallers and "discourag'd" the masons, Mary of Guise continued to collaborate with both fraternities.¹⁰⁶ In 1559, when a faction of Protestant nobles determined to depose her, she appealed to the common people over the heads of the nobility. In order to win over the craftsmen of Edinburgh, she worked to secure them a vote in burgh elections. Her own master mason, the Frenchman Roytell, served as a burgess in the city.¹⁰⁷ Two years earlier, she had appointed the Fifth Lord Seton as provost, and he used his office to increase the power of the craftsmen. However, the magistrates sided with the Reformers and refused to allow the deacons of the crafts to vote for council officers. The deacons protested this decision and "even avowed their future disobedience."¹⁰⁸ Despite the campaign of the queen mother and the craftsmen, the Protestant magistrates ejected Seton and branded him a "man without God," who "troubled the 'brethren.'"¹⁰⁹ In late 1559 she called Seton back to serve as governor of Edinburgh, in order to protect the churches from militant Reformers bent on the destruction of Catholic "images."

Even worse for Mary and her loyal masons was the attack by the radicals on the monasteries of Perth, in which the great Charterhouse was desecrated. Knox, whose violent sermon inspired the assault, was pleased by the expulsion of the friars and destruction of the Gothic buildings:

... within two days, these three great places, monuments of idolatry, to wit, the Grey and Black thieves, and Charterhouse monks (a building of wondrous cost and greatness) were so destroyed that the walls only did remain of all those great edifications.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁶ J. Anderson, *Constitutions* (1723), 36—on Elizabeth's anti-masonic policies.

¹⁰⁷ H. Paton, *Accounts*, xxxiv.

¹⁰⁸ G. Seton, *History*, I, 161.

¹⁰⁹ B. Seton, *House*, 143–45.

¹¹⁰ J. Knox, *History*, I, 163.

In 1633 when Bishop Laud examined the ruins of Scottish churches destroyed during Knox's campaign, he commented that "it was not a reformation but a deformation."¹¹¹ In 1696 Jonathan Swift would characterize Knox as "Knocking Jack of the North."¹¹²

Though Knox gloated at the smashing of "the tabernacle" on the altar, the desecration worried more moderate Protestants in Perth. Knox referred scornfully to those whose "consciences so moved them, that they suffered those hypocrites [the friars] to take away what they could." The popular sympathy for the Carthusians at Perth was rooted in their high moral standards and services to the poor, which continued despite the deterioration in many other orders.¹¹³ Moreover, as Lee argues, the Catholic monasteries were not moribund: "the impulse for reform from within was still there."¹¹⁴ A few religious houses continued to encourage the development of crafts and trade, which meant that they had pockets of local supporters who resisted the radicals' assault on the brotherhoods.

The destruction of the great Charterhouse would reverberate in masonic memory for decades, as witnessed by the tribute to its builders given in *The Muses Threnodie* (1638). Though the Protestant poet, Henry Adamson, sympathized with the Perth Reformers, he remembered that "This Abbay's steeples, and its turrets . . . were cunningly contriv'd with curious art,/And quintessence of skill in everie part."¹¹⁵ His friend, the ninety-two year-old John Gall, had heard tales from his grandfather about the talented masons, from several countries, who built the Charterhouse. Though Adamson explained that under Knox's inspired leadership, "all men cry'd, Raze, raze, the time is come," he also conceded that many townspeople were shocked at the violence and "the fear full people ran to their devotion." The descendants of the foreign masons who witnessed the destruction of their ancestors' great architectural achievements must have shared the outrage of Mary of Guise, when she learned of the desecration of the Gothic monuments.

Mary protested to the nobility that Knox and his party were dedicated to total rebellion against the crown and church. Knox recorded

¹¹¹ "William Laud," *DNB*.

¹¹² Jonathan Swift, *A Tale of a Tub*, 2nd ed., eds. A.C. Guthkelch and D.N. Smith (Oxford: Clarendon, 1958), 50.

¹¹³ G. Donaldson, *Scotland*, 134.

¹¹⁴ Maurice Lee, *Great Britain's Solomon: James VI and I in His Three Kingdoms* (Urbana: Chicago UP, 1990), 5.

¹¹⁵ H. Adamson, *Muses Threnodie*, 10, 52, 55-56.

that “she did grievously aggreage [lay stress upon] the destruction of the Charterhouse, because it was a King’s foundation; and there was the tomb of King James the First.”¹¹⁶ The king’s tomb was especially revered by the populace because it contained his heart, which had been taken to Jerusalem and returned by the Knights of St. John. A disgusted Knox recorded that Mary’s argument was so successful that “she made the most part of them [the nobles] to pursue us.” The abbot of Kilwinning, as protector of another monument of Scottish masonry, was determined to avenge the sacking of Perth, and he urged the moderate Protestant lords to join in punishment of the radicals. Apparently recognizing that his “brethren” had gone too far, Knox then tried to prevent the sacking of the abbey at Scone, but the mob was implacable. Within this context, Knox’s praise of the murderers of Cochrane, master mason to James III, seems targeted at those masons who supported the queen mother and were appalled at the destruction of their Gothic and Renaissance edifices.

In *The Muses Threnodie*, the author remembered “the Burghs distractions,” when “Papists and Protestants made diverse factions.”¹¹⁷ And, while he supported the Reformers’ cause (seven decades after the event), he regretted the destruction of the beautiful architecture created by Catholic stonemasons. Though we know little about the eventual conversion of most Scottish masons to the Protestant church, the Freemasons’ later advocacy of religious tolerance and loyalty to the sovereign may have been rooted in the traumatic events of 1559–60.

Among the Queen Mother’s strongest supporters was John St. Clair, dean of Restalrig, who returned from France at this time to argue that liberty of conscience be granted to Catholics and Protestants. As a member of the famous masonic family, St. Clair’s opinion may have represented that of the masonic lodges. When Knox praised the murder of an earlier master mason and king’s favorite, did he go too far in antagonizing St. Clair and the masons? In 1560, shortly after the death of Mary of Guise on 11 June, a party of craftsmen in Edinburgh rebelled against Knox’s radical policies. Though some “deacons of crafts” of the burgh had gone along with a city ruling that all brothel-keepers, whoremasters, and harlots who do not give

¹¹⁶ J. Knox, *History*, I, 163–64, 191, 221.

¹¹⁷ H. Adamson, *Muses Threnodie*, 58.

testimony of their Protestant conversion were to be brutally punished, a party of “ungodly craftsmen” (Knox’s words) refused to allow the execution of a fellow artisan for remarrying after obtaining a “Papist” divorce.¹¹⁸ According to Knox, the actions of the “unhonest craftsmen” in threatening the law officers and liberating the prisoner “was the beginning of further evils.”

The rebellious craftsmen also defied the Reformers’ laws, imposed in 1555, that they could no longer enjoy their spring festivities in which Robin Hood, the Abbot of Unreason, and the Queen of May entertained a populace temporarily released from their drab routine lives. The craft guilds had long cherished their role as patrons of these religious and seasonal celebrations, and many of their members clung tenaciously to “the rich life of symbol which they nourished,” which the Reformers “cut at the roots.”¹¹⁹ While Knox harangued the craftsmen for their devotion to idolatrous and frivolous traditions, they “made a mutiny” and set up a Robin Hood.¹²⁰ When the Protestant authorities cracked down and sentenced a shoemaker to execution, “some known dishonest craftsmen” invaded the chamber and rescued him. Knox claimed that the craftsmen came to him to solicit help after the first tumult, but that he would no longer “be a patron to their impiety.” However, Knox was miffed when the craftsmen were powerful enough to secure a promise from the provost that the authorities would not pursue them for their “crimes.”

While the late queen mother lay unburied in August 1560, the Protestant-dominated Parliament at Edinburgh abolished the jurisdiction of the Pope and banned the Catholic mass in Scotland. Protestantism became the official, though not the majority, religion in Scotland. While Knox advocated a Calvinistic-Presbyterian system, in which congregations elected their elders and ministers, many royally-appointed bishops continued to serve in a traditional “Episcopal” fashion. Believing that he had defeated the Papist “Whore of Babylon,” Knox now preached on the need to re-build the house of God. That he took his text from the *Book of Haggai* suggests his ongoing struggle against the royalist masons and rebellious craftsmen.

¹¹⁸ J. Knox, *History*, I, 356–57.

¹¹⁹ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 122.

¹²⁰ J. Knox, *History*, I, 357.

The Lord asks the prophet Haggai, "Is it time for you, O ye, to dwell in your cieled houses, and this house lay waste? . . . Go up to the mountain, and bring wood, and build the house; and I will take pleasure in it." The stress on wood, not stone, as the building material seemed deliberate. But, in an attempt to conciliate the craftsmen, Knox went on to quote God's exhortation to Haggai that he ask Zerubbabel and the Jews, "Who is left among you that saw this house [the Temple] in her first glory?" If they think the wooden house is as nothing compared to the first, they should have faith that "The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of the former." Despite Knox's harangues, the majority of masons and artisans in Edinburgh remained Catholic in the years immediately after the Reformation of 1560. As Stevenson observes, "One of the major problems for the new protestant regime was to find new outlets for the religious devotion of the craftsmen."¹²¹

In the meantime, the changing religious situation in Scotland reverberated in the Hospitaller council in Malta, where the Grand Master declared in August 1560 that the preceptorship of Torpichen should be transferred to John James Sandilands, with a "mandate to allow him and assist him in gaining possession."¹²² At the same time, the Protestant Lords of the Congregation in Scotland—with the assistance of Knox—named James Sandilands as their representative to the new queen of Scotland, Mary Stewart, and her husband, King François II of France. The Lord St. John of Torpichen was instructed to present the acts of the "Reformation Parliament" as a *fait accompli*, which included a peace treaty with England as well as a break with the Papacy. In route to Paris, he met secretly with the government ministers of Elizabeth I, and he arrived as a full-fledged agent of the English Protestant party. The odd choice of Sandilands, whom Knox dishonestly portrayed as independent of all factions, was evidently a ploy to gain acceptance of the Reformers' agenda by the French Grand Prior, Francis of Guise, who was revered by his niece, now Mary Queen of Scots.

According to the English ambassador Throckmorton, "the Lord of St. John's" was at first "made much of" by the French court, but "after a few days not so much."¹²³ Provocatively, Queen Mary

¹²¹ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 122.

¹²² I. Cowan, *Knights of St. John*, 189.

¹²³ CSP, *Foreign Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1560–1561* (London, 1865), 408.

and the Grand Prior had received information on the challenge to Sandilands mounted by his kinsman in Malta. On 8 September the French king conferred with the Cardinal of Lorraine, brother of the Grand Prior, on the actions of the Scottish Parliament and their spokesman, the controversial James Sandilands. As Throckmorton reported to Elizabeth I,

... The matters of Scotland are greatly disliked; the sending of great persons into England and the Lord of St. John's hither, seemed not to the French Queen equal dealing; the Queen [Mary Stewart] has said that if the Lord of St. John's come hither he were best to bring his new married wife with him; and that upon his coming she would send him to Malta, to have his case judged. Some other might be sent who is without exception.¹²⁴

On 17 November Queen Mary complained again about the irregularity of the actions of the Scottish Parliament, and she repeated her scorn for Sandilands, who had broken the vow of celibacy taken by the Knights of St. John and who was an unworthy representative for Scotland.¹²⁵ On that same day, Throckmorton received news that "the Knights of the Order" shall be assembled at Orleans, where the Protestant King of Navarre and the Prince of Condé had been arrested by François II. Even worse, "the French King minds to convert all his abbeys into commanderies of divers orders, as in Spain." These developments, which eventually split France into warring religious factions, would ramify into Scotland, where James Sandilands later undertook the final dissolution of the Knights Hospitallers as a Catholic military order.

When Queen Mary made clear that she would not tolerate sedition in Scotland, Sandilands realized that his effort to gain ratification of the peace treaty with England was doomed. On 28 November Throckmorton reported to the English court:

The Lord of St. John, weighing all things, lately required the writer to recommend especially to the Queen [Elizabeth] the affairs of Scotland, saying that unless she order and manage them speedily they will fall asunder and be utterly undone . . . These men [French supporters of Queen Mary] much depend on the advice of one Henry Sinclair in Scotland, and Lord Seton has letters to him.¹²⁶

¹²⁴ Ibid., 293.

¹²⁵ Ibid., 394–95.

¹²⁶ Ibid., 409.

Lord Seton, who had taken refuge in France after the failure of his campaign for the craftsmen in Edinburgh, now advised the young queen about the violent proceedings of the Reformers in Scotland. Moreover, he received information from the St. Clair family, traditional protectors of the masons in Scotland. Thus, the formation of Queen Mary's first policies for her new kingdom was influenced by representatives of the old chivalric, masonic traditions maintained by previous Stewart monarchs.

As a crypto-Protestant who hoped to overturn those traditions, James Sandilands soon realized that he had no influence on the new queen. He left France, stopped over in London and conferred secretly with Elizabeth, who employed him to work for the pro-English party in Scotland. As far as the Grand Master at Malta was concerned, James Sandilands was no longer the Grand Prior of Scotland; his office was transferred to his Catholic kinsman John James. However, James continued to call himself Lord St. John of Torpichen, while he secretly worked with Knox and the English to dissolve the ancient Scottish branch of the Hospitallers.

On 5 December 1560 the young French monarch François II died suddenly, and his widow faced a situation in which the king of Navarre would replace the Guises as the dominant power in France. That the Guises still hoped to utilize the Knights of St. John in their struggle to gain the French throne is suggested by the bizarre proposal that the widowed Mary should be betrothed to her uncle, the Grand Prior, a move which would require a Papal dispensation.¹²⁷ However, the grief-stricken Mary was not interested in a rapid remarriage. Moreover, she hoped to meet Queen Elizabeth and to develop a peaceful relationship between Scotland, France, and England. When Elizabeth refused to give her a safe-conduct, Mary impulsively sailed for Scotland, where she received a rapturous welcome from her new subjects. On 19 August 1561 even the wary Knox reported that the Protestants rushed to join the crowds welcoming the new monarch when she landed at Leith. In certain details, the arrival of Queen Mary summed up two significant strands of her late mother's policies—the royal collaboration with the Knights of St. John and with the masons.

The new queen used the French spelling "Stuart," which intensified her negative French-Papist image among the radical Protestants.

¹²⁷ Ibid., 459.

When she arrived in Scotland, she was accompanied by her uncle Duke Francis, whom Knox scornfully identified as “the Grand Prior.”¹²⁸ The duke also served as general of the galleys and commanded the ships that brought Mary to Scotland.¹²⁹ This fact must have particularly galled Knox, who had earlier been sentenced to the French galleys on charges of heresy and sedition. Knox also knew that the late queen mother relied on the Hospitallers for secret communications. Even worse, while Mary and the Grand Prior rode out from Leith, “the rebels of the crafts” met her, and she granted them absolution. Attributing the queen’s mercy to her Papistical prejudices, Knox claimed that “because she was sufficiently instructed that all they did was done in despite of the religion, they were easily pardoned.” When the queen sponsored a great masque at Holyrood as a farewell tribute to the Grand Prior and his French party, Knox harangued them for their frivolity and extravagance.

Meanwhile, in the south, Elizabeth I not only suppressed the Knights of St. John but she intensified her campaign against the masons and craftsmen. In 1738 the anti-Jacobite historian Anderson claimed that Elizabeth ordered her Grand Master, Thomas Sackville, to break up an assembly of Freemasons at York on 27 December 1561.¹³⁰ In 1761 the Scottish historian Auld elaborated on this story, noting that since the suppressions by earlier kings and “the bloody wars of the houses of York and Lancaster, and afterwards by other means,” the craft of masonry suffered neglect. Further impediment came from Queen Elizabeth,

... [who] hearing that the Masons had some secrets they could not, or would not reveal to her, she became jealous of their assemblies, and sent an armed force to break up their annual communication at York on St. John’s day, December 27, 1561. But Sir Thomas Sackville, then Grand-Master, took care to send some of the great officers of the Queen, that were Masons, who then joining their assembly, made honourable report to the Queen, who ever after esteemed them as the cultivators of peace, friendship, brotherly love, arts and sciences, and never meddled with those who were given to change.¹³¹

Though Auld’s last statements, which were historically inaccurate, were part of his effort to conciliate English and Scottish Masons,

¹²⁸ J. Knox, *History*, II, 7–8.

¹²⁹ J. Robertson, *Inventaires*, lxxv.

¹³⁰ J. Anderson, *Constitutions (1738)*, 81.

¹³¹ [W. Auld], *Freemasons Pocket Companion*, 94.

other Masonic commentators long considered Elizabeth I to be an enemy of the craft. Even Auld conceded that the progress of Freemasonry would have been more rapid, "if Queen Elizabeth had not discouraged the study of architecture." Reinforcing this criticism by eighteenth-century Freemasons, Girouard stresses that the "lack of enlightened patronage of the visual arts, and the small estimation in which they were held, meant that there were no Elizabethan architects."¹³² Moreover, the Royal Office of Works—which supervised building projects—was "creatively torpid under Elizabeth."

Meanwhile, north of the border, the charm and generosity of Queen Mary Stuart soon won over many of her Protestant subjects, especially her half-brother, John Lord Stewart, whom she relied upon for advice in all matters. Though the victory of the Reformation Parliament of 1560 meant that Scotland was officially a Protestant nation with an independent "kirk," neither Mary nor the moderates wanted to persecute those who differed in their religious beliefs. For her personal service she chose loyal Catholics, such as George, Fifth Lord Seton, who was appointed Master of the Household. While the Setons continued their ambitious architectural projects, the queen retained the loyalty of the masons. However, she was unable to launch any ecclesiastical or royal building projects because of the religious and financial austerity imposed upon her by the Parliament. Thus, her reign represented a hiatus in the long tradition of practical collaboration between "masonic" monarch and craftsmen.

Nevertheless, according to eighteenth-century Freemasons, the Scottish lodges maintained their secret teaching and preserved it until better days. In 1733, a London periodical, *The Free-Mason*, summed up this period of Masonic history: "On the Sun-set of Masonry to the Southern and Western parts of the Globe, the antient Masons of Scotland, Stars of the North, preserv'd its Light and return'd it to Mankind."¹³³ The special Scottish "light" of Masonry consisted of the esoteric traditions preserved and later amplified in lodges loyal to the Stewart-Stuart dynasty. In 1736 Ramsay claimed that Scottish chivalric Masonry survived the Elizabethan period because it was "founded on the annals of the most ancient race in the world," the

¹³² M. Girouard, *Smythson*, 6, 10.

¹³³ *The Free-Mason*, no. 5 (11 December 1733); quoted in Knoop and Jones, *Genesis*, 225.

Jewish, which was “the only one still in existence with the same name as of old and not intermingled with other nations.”¹³⁴

Queen Mary inherited from her Guise kinsmen an interest in the Hebraic and Hermetic mystical traditions, which were studied by the reform wing of universalist Catholics. Early in her reign, in November 1561, she welcomed a delegation of French humanist scholars and poets who were dedicated to a Cabalistic-Hermetic-Platonic regeneration of the Catholic church.¹³⁵ One poet praised the queen and her scholarly mentor, George Buchanan, for reviving the traditions of religious verse immortalized by the great David, King of the Jews. Dorsten points out that religious Hermeticism encouraged its adepts—whether Catholic or Protestant—to work for toleration and conciliation and that their message received a warmer welcome in Edinburgh than London at this time. Perhaps inspired by her French visitors, Mary wrote to the Lullist theosopher Cardano and urged him to return to Scotland. According to Cardano, the “Queen of Scotland” sent him “promises magnificent but too remote for certainty.”¹³⁶

Nevertheless, in 1566, the Scottish court received a visitor who had recently witnessed public demonstrations of the Lullist-Cardanist Art of Memory in Italy. Joseph Scaliger, the brilliant Huguenot scholar and friend of Buchanan, recounted the incredible feats of “artificial memory” that he witnessed in Rome—just before traveling to Edinburgh.¹³⁷ At this time, Mary enjoyed scholarly conversations with the “Judaizing” Buchanan, who had participated in the Lullist revival in Paris. She and her mentor must have been intrigued by Scaliger’s experiences, for he had been so inspired by the “illuminated” Postel that he became a master of Hebrew and Jewish lore.¹³⁸ While visiting the Jewish communities of northern Italy and southern France, Scaliger enjoyed conversations in Hebrew with masters of Cabala and Talmud. The acerbic Scaliger later bestowed rare praise, when he observed that “les Ecossois sont bons philosophes”

¹³⁴ C. Batham, “Chevalier Ramsay,” 301.

¹³⁵ For the visit of “the great religious Hermetist” Francois de Foix and his party to Edinburgh, see J.A. Van Dorsten, *The Radical Arts* (London: Oxford UP, 1970), 6–9, 24–25.

¹³⁶ G. Cardan, *My Life*, 16, 299n.20.

¹³⁷ Anthony Grafton, “Close Encounters of the Learned Kind: Joseph Scaliger’s Table Talk,” *The American Scholar*, 57 (1988), 586–87.

¹³⁸ Anthony Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983), I, 104, 275.

and contrasted them favorably to the English, whom he considered fanatic and xenophobic.¹³⁹

Though much of Mary's library was later destroyed by English soldiers and Scottish Reformers, the surviving books from her personal collection reveal her curiosity about neo-Platonic and Hermetic traditions. She not only acquired "the Poemander of Hermes Trismegistus" but the *Dialogues d'Amour* of "Leon the Hebrew" (Abravanel), which mingled Cabalism, Hermeticism, and neo-Platonism. Like Lefèvre and Buchanan, she studied the astronomical work of Johannes de Sacrobosco, *De Sphaera*, which included sections on divination and prediction.¹⁴⁰ Many Scots believed that the medieval Sacrobosco ("Holy wood/rood") was one of their countrymen and, since the time of his astrological commentary on the text attributed to Michael Scot, *De Sphaera* and its accumulated occultist trappings were considered particularly relevant to Scottish affairs.¹⁴¹ Given the collaboration between the Guises and the famous prophet Nostradamus, Mary's interest in the visionary and predictive arts is not surprising.

Of particular and disturbing interest was the astrological treatise of the Scottish author James Bassantine. According to Mary's courtier James Melville, Bassantine had travelled widely and become "learned in high sciences" of astrology, alchemy, and Cabala.¹⁴² Defending himself against Presbyterian charges that he practised unlawfull arts, Bassantine argued that even the Protestant Reformer Melancthon approved of "the natural sciences, that are lawful and daily read in divers Christian universities." While Mary tirelessly tried to meet with Elizabeth of England, Bassantine predicted that the meeting would never take place and that Mary would eventually endure a "lengthy captivity and utter wreck" at the hands of Elizabeth. However, eventually "the kingdom of England shall of right fall to the crown of Scotland and that there are some born at this instant that shall enjoy and make use of ["bruk"] lands and heritages in England." Though this was received as "false, ungodly," and "devilish newes" in 1562, the fulfillment of Bassantine's prediction would later give a *frisson* to Scottish students of the visionary sciences.

¹³⁹ Jacob Bernays, *Joseph Justus Scaliger* (1855; New York: Burt Franklin, 1965), 139.

¹⁴⁰ Hume Brown, *Buchanan*, 164; J. Robertson, *Inventaires*, civ.

¹⁴¹ Lynn Thorndike, *The "Sphere" of Sacrobosco and Its Commentators* (Chicago: Chicago UP, 1949), 21–54.

¹⁴² J. Robertson, *Inventaires*, cxi. Spelling modernized.

Mary Stuart also sustained an interest in the crusading orders and read avidly in the romance literature as well as the histories of the Knights of the Temple and Hospital.¹⁴³ Like the Guises, she saw herself as a descendant of Godfrey of Bouillon and the kings of Jerusalem. Perhaps influenced by the Parisian Lullists, she had once believed that the chivalric orders could be instruments of religious toleration and pacification. Though her mother had successfully utilized the Knights of St. John for delicate and secret negotiations, Mary now had to face the fact of Protestant hostility to the order. With the Grand Prior of Scotland exposed as an apostate, she soon grieved at the loss of both uncles, who had been such ardent supporters of the Hospitallers. In spring 1563 the Duke of Guise was assassinated by a French Protestant, and the Grand Prior died of natural causes.

At the same time in Malta, the Grand Prior appointed for Scotland, John James Sandilands, proved unworthy of the office, for he degenerated into a brawler and thief and was eventually executed.¹⁴⁴ In an effort to promote religious harmony, Mary acquiesced in the secularization of Torpichen by the Protestant Lords of the Congregation. Having gained more Hospitaller and "Temple lands" through his marriage, James Sandilands agreed to resign all the order's properties into the hands of the queen, who then re-granted them to Sandilands as the "hereditary barony of Torpichen" in 1564. Though the latter's payment of 10,000 crowns eased the loss, the knights at Malta recognized that Scotland would no longer provide a base for recruitment and revenue-raising. Ironically, the knights lost Torpichen just before they regained international prestige for their heroic victory over the Turks at Malta in 1565. Macquarrie notes that the order still attracted young Catholic nobles who were out of sympathy with the Reform movement in their own country; moreover, "the crusading spirit, which had attracted Scotsmen into the military orders since the days of King David I and Hugh de Paiens [Grand Master of the Templars] was not totally extinguished."¹⁴⁵

While Mary struggled to maintain her position as a Catholic monarch in a Protestant-governed country, she was comforted by

¹⁴³ Ibid., cvii-cix.

¹⁴⁴ I. Cowan, *Knights of St. John*, 189-90.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., lv. The barony is still held by members of the Sandilands family, and a Protestant version of the Hospitallers now meets in the remains of the priory at Torpichen.

the fact that "the bulk of the ordinary population, both rural and urban, was still not converted to the new faith."¹⁴⁶ She was also pleased that the few surviving Hospitallers remained faithful to her cause. In 1567 James Irving fled Scotland rather than subscribe to the Reformers' "Confession of Faith," and he was subsequently welcomed into the order by the Grand Master at Malta.¹⁴⁷ In 1572 Irving went to Rome and France, persuading the Pope and cardinals that he could do useful work on their behalf in Scotland. However, he was betrayed by English spies at the French court and was imprisoned and tortured when he returned to Scotland.

Irving's fate persuaded Sir David Seton to lead the remaining brethren out of Scotland to a refuge in Germany. The bitterness of many Catholics over the sell-out of Torpichen to the "treacherous" Sandilands was reflected in a Scottish poem of the later sixteenth century, entitled "The Holy Kirk and the Theeves":

Fye upon the traitor then,
Who has brought us to such pass,
Greedy as the knave Judas;
Fye upon the churl that sold
Holy Earth for heavy gold;
But the Order felt no loss,
When David Seton bore the Cross.¹⁴⁸

When Seton died abroad in 1591, he represented the last titular commander of the Scottish Knights of St. John of the Hospital. That he may also have represented the secret "Order of the Temple," preserved by his family for centuries, is still an open question.

After Queen Mary's disastrous marriage to Bothwell, who was accused of seducing her through black magic, she sensed the increasing danger of her position. In 1567 she copied the French king's custom of maintaining a personal bodyguard of Scottish archers, who swore oaths of chivalric loyalty to the sovereign.¹⁴⁹ As events in Scotland moved tumultuously from Mary's flight to England in 1568 and her subsequent eleven-year imprisonment on orders of Queen Elizabeth,

¹⁴⁶ Michael Lynch, ed., *Mary Stewart, Queen in Three Kingdoms* (Oxford: Blackwell's, 1988), 10.

¹⁴⁷ I. Cowan, *Knights of St. John*, 118–19.

¹⁴⁸ E.J. King, *The Grand Priory of the Order of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem in England* (London: St. John's Gate, 1924), 67. Spelling modernized.

¹⁴⁹ George Buchanan, *The Tyrannous Reign of Mary Stewart*, trans. and ed. W.A. Gatherer (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1958), 62.

the fate of the Hospitallers and the Catholic masons underwent a long eclipse during the minority of her son, James VI. When James Sandilands, the secularized Lord Torpichen died in 1580, his papers and properties passed on to his sons, who—provocatively—considered themselves heirs of the Knights Templar. According to John Stuart, who examined the family papers in 1871, the Sandilands family possessed “many papers connected with Templar possessions,” including “Royal charters of privilege and confirmation of Alexander II and Robert I in favour of the House of Templars.”¹⁵⁰ Moreover, through Lord Torpichen’s son James, “the inheritance of the Knights Templars became united with that of West Calder” (the Sandilands’ ancient domain).

It is possible that the eighteenth-century revival of Templarism as a Scottish Masonic rite was rooted in its assimilation into Protestantism by the Sandilands family. Moreover, James Sandilands and his heirs supported Mary’s Protestant son, James VI, who would eventually nourish both crusader and masonic ideals. In the 1580’s, when Scotland and France were wracked by religious conflict, James observed the devastation caused by the loss of the internationalist ideals of the crusaders. When he became King James VI *and I* of Scotland *and England*, he and his sons would attempt to revive the chivalric and Lullist ideals of the Gothic architects and knights in the lodges of Freemasonry and chapters of the Order of the Garter.

¹⁵⁰ John Stuart, “The Papers of the Right Honourable Lord Torpichen at Calder House,” *HMC: Second Report* (London, 1871), 196.

CHAPTER FOUR

JAMES VI, SCOTLAND'S SOLOMON: THE MAKING OF A "MASON KING" (1567–1603)

In Queen Elizabeth's time Architecture made no growth: but rather went backwards.

—John Aubrey, "Chronologia Architectonica" (1671)

The Kings of Scotland very much encouraged the Royal Art, from the earliest Times down to the Union of the Crowns, as appears by the Remains of glorious buildings in that ancient Kingdom, and by the Lodges there kept up without Interruption many hundred Years, the Records and Traditions of which testify the great Respect of those Kings to this honourable Fraternity . . . King James VI of Scotland succeeding to the Crown of England, being a Mason King, reviv'd the English lodges . . .

—James Anderson, *Constitutions of the Freemasons* (1723)

When the one year-old James Stuart was named King James VI of Scotland in July 1567, his deposed mother was imprisoned and forbidden to see him. In psychological and architectural terms, James was born into a maternal and masonic hiatus. As MacKechnie notes, "the dismantling of Mary's court, iconoclasm, and diminution of ecclesiastical patronage of the visual arts represented a cultural reversal."¹ Though the new monarch "inherited a brilliant—arguably, sometimes precocious—series of royal palaces" from preceding Stewart kings, Queen Mary's troubled reign produced a breakdown in the traditional linkage of monarch, architect, and mason. Disputes about Scotland's Hebraic heritage also arose, as competing factions struggled for the kingdom's religious soul. Thus, the development of James VI into "Scotland's Solomon" and a "Mason King" was not predictable, given the circumstances of his early upbringing and education.

The regency was established in James Stewart, Earl of Moray, who committed the infant to the care of the Countess of Mar, whose

¹ Aonghus MacKechnie, "James VI's Architects and their Architecture," in Julian Goodare and Michael Lynch, eds., *The Reign of James VI* (East Linton: Tuckwell, 2000), 155–56.

family had long served as masters of the royal household. From age four the young king was tutored by the Protestant scholars George Buchanan and Peter Young, who joined the countess in instilling in him an abhorrence of the Papism and alleged depravity of his mother, whom he never saw again. While both scholars inculcated firm Protestant beliefs in the child, they also drew on their long experiences in France to give him a broad humanist education. However, the dominant influence of John Knox on the early Reformers created another “cultural reversal,” in which the Scots’ identification with the Jewish defenders of the Temple was called into question. Unlike earlier Scottish historians, who stressed the Scots’ resemblance to the Maccabees, Knox “adopted the analogy which identified early Christians with the reformers and their persecutors with the Jews.”² He lambasted the Spanish Catholics as descendants of the Jews, which “histories do witnesse and they themselves confesse,” while “of course” Bloody Mary Tudor was of Spanish descent, as even her promoters admitted when they linked her to “the roote of Jesse.” The more militant preachers hoped to inculcate this anti-Semitic attitude into the young king.

Fortunately, though James’s tutor Buchanan was an admirer of Knox, his earlier experiences in the Marranist communities of France produced a more sympathetic attitude towards Judaism. Throughout James’s childhood, Buchanan was also in touch with the ecumenical Plantin Press at Antwerp, and he may have unwittingly exposed some Scottish courtiers to its radically tolerant agenda. Because many historians argue that the Plantin Press operated as a front for a kind of “pre-Freemasonry,” a brief account of its history will provide a valuable international context for later Masonic developments in Scotland and England. The press was founded by Christophe Plantin, a journeyman printer from Tours. Before moving to Antwerp in 1555, Plantin had been admitted to the Guild of St. Luke, an incorporation of various artistic crafts, where he may have learned something of the oral traditions of the *compagnonnage*, the secret fraternity of French masons and carpenters.³ Plantin named his new press “The Golden Compasses,” and his publications featured the motto *Labore e Constantia*, represented emblematically by a compass, in which the stationary point stood for constancy and the moving point for labor.

² A. Williamson, “British Israel,” 108.

³ Leon Voet, *The Golden Compasses* (Amsterdam: Vangendt, 1969), I, v, 12–31.

Plantin's private motive for establishing the press was to publish works advocating the mystical message of the "Family of Love," an international secret society which sought "to reconcile the extremes of militant Protestantism and Catholicism by urging the ideal of religious toleration based on the Christian principle of love."⁴ Plantin had been recruited to the sect by its founder Hendrik Niklaes of Emden, who preached an irenic Hermeticism in the name of the "House of Love." The Golden Compasses was subsidized by a group of wealthy Catholic merchants, who were secret disciples of Niklaes and who hoped their ecumenical religious projects would bring peace and prosperity to Europe. While Plantin published many heterodox works, including Cabalistic treatises, he was also protected by a network of wealthy Marranos (crypto-Jews) and dissident Calvinists who were interested in a religious revolution that would usher in an era of tolerance.⁵ The Familists practised a Nicodemite strategy in which members conformed publicly to the religion of their resident country, while they privately maintained their non-sectarian spiritualist beliefs.

From his earliest days, Plantin found ready customers in Scotland, and many of his fine productions, featuring his striking masonic-style emblem, found their way into the libraries of Stuart monarchs and courtiers. Plantin in turn became interested in the writings of Buchanan, and the Golden Compasses published his Judaized drama of *Jephthes* and his paraphrases of the Hebrew psalms in 1566.⁶ At the same time that Plantin solicited more work from Buchanan, he was joined by the erudite Hebraists Andreas Masius, Guillaume Postel, and the brothers Guy and Nicolas Lefèvre de la Boderie, who collaborated in the production of a new polyglot Bible that would be faithful to its sources in Semitic and Classical languages. Like Plantin, Postel may have had contacts with initiates of the *compagnonnage*, as suggested by his strange story of a French "wood craftsman" who experienced a vision calling for reform of the French monarchy and society.⁷ Postel's role in the Bible project was kept secret because of his reputation as a revolutionary Cabalist.

⁴ Michael Srigley, "The Influence of Continental Familism in England after 1570," in Gunnar Sorelius and Michael Srigley, eds., *Cultural Exchange between European Nations during the Renaissance* (Uppsala, 1994), 100.

⁵ B. Rekers, *Benito Arias Montano (1527-1598)* (London: Warburg Institute, 1972), 70-71.

⁶ I. Macfarlane, *Buchanan*, 255, 259.

⁷ See Marion Kuntz, *Guillaume Postel* (The Hague: Martinus Nyhoff, 1981), 53.

Through the Familist network of heterodox scholars and artisans, Plantin learned of the Lullist interests of the Spanish king Philip II and his architects at the Escorial. In 1567 he successfully sought the patronage of Philip for the polyglot *Biblia Sacra, Hebraice, Chaldaice, Graece et Latine*. The Spanish monarch then sent Benito Arias Montano to Antwerp to supervise the project and to contribute his vast knowledge of Jewish sources. When the eight volumes appeared in 1569–72, the heavy reliance on Talmudic and Cabalistic texts provoked opposition from orthodox scholars but praise from humanists and Hermeticists. Among Montano's admirers was George Buchanan, who maintained contact with the Spanish Lullist while serving as tutor to James VI.⁸ The Plantin Bible was often used by Scottish scholars, and it would later have an important influence on the production of the King James Authorized Bible in 1604–11. Among later Freemasons, the sections written by Montano on the architecture of the Tabernacle and Temple were of particular interest, for they believed that the distinctive Plantin images on the title-pages (hand with compass emerging from cloud to draw a three-quarter circle, square, globe, astrolabe, etc.) were fraught with Masonic import.

While working in Antwerp, the Catholic Montano was converted to Familist beliefs by Plantin. After his return to the Escorial to serve as royal librarian, Montano sought recruits for the sect among the resident monks. From this clandestine cell, the librarian and his brothers carried on a coded correspondence with initiates in many countries. Montano helped identify and promote public and political figures in Spain and Flanders who were privately sympathetic to the sect's beliefs and ecumenical policies. Rekers observes that "one might be tempted to believe that there existed some sort of 'freemasonry' under Familist guidance," though there is no surviving evidence.⁹ Moss goes further to point out the parallels between Niklaes's reorganization of the "new House of Love" and later Masonic organization, for its "peculiar structure" seemed to merge elements of Catholic hierarchy and ritual with "the arcane ceremonies of the Freemasons."¹⁰ Under the direction of elders, the "little ones" were

⁸ B. Rekers, *Montano*, 74n.2.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 126.

¹⁰ Jean Dietz Moss, "*Godded with God*": *Hendrik Niclaes and His Family of Love* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1981), 21.

taken through stages of growing enlightenment and degrees of the priesthood of "holy understanding."

In Niklaes's treatises, especially *A Figure of the True and Spiritual Tabernacle according to the Inward Temple or House of God in the Spirit*, there were visionary descriptions of the Temple of Jerusalem and an emphasis on rebuilding the Temple within the individual man. In Elizabethan England many craftsmen were attracted to the sect, and these may have included masons who remembered the Solomonic Temple lore of their medieval predecessors. Among the rituals of the Familists were several—moral examination of the candidate, oral transmission of secrets, symbolic knocks and passwords, and spiritual regeneration—that would emerge in later Freemasonry. Except for Plantin's correspondence with Buchanan, there is no surviving record of Familists in Scotland. However, Scottish refugees from religious persecution—both Protestant and Catholic—were welcomed at Plantin's House of Love.

In the early 1570's, Plantin wrote to Buchanan and urged him to finish his edition of Sacrabosco's *Sphaera*, which reflected Buchanan's continuing interest in astronomy and mathematics.¹¹ During this period, the Familist sect split into two factions, one more Protestant and devoted to Niklaes and the other more Catholic and devoted to a new prophet "Hiël." Both Plantin and Montano followed the charismatic Hiël, who urged his followers to practice a demanding process of meditation which guided them to illumination and union with God (they became "Begodded Men"). At Philip II's magnificent Escorial palace, Montano and his secret brotherhood incorporated Familist with Lullist techniques. The outside world knew little of the sect's clandestine beliefs, schisms, or maneuverings behind the scenes of secular and religious politics. There is no evidence that Buchanan was aware of the more esoteric beliefs and practices of Plantin's network, but he may have informed his royal pupil of their ecumenical notions. When James VI became king of England, he would display sympathy for the Familists and fascination with the Lullist architects and masons of the Escorial.¹² Moreover, royal pupil would become more irenic than royal tutor.

¹¹ I. Macfarlane, *Buchanan*, 260.

¹² See Chapter 5.

In 1572 James Douglas, Fourth Earl of Morton, became regent and instituted “a near reign of terror” over the intimidated James, for he had a fierce temper and demanded absolute obedience to his will.¹³ Morton was a close friend of Knox, and when the fiery Reformer died in November the earl delivered the eulogy at his funeral. After Knox’s death, Buchanan abandoned his early Judaizing tendencies and became more anti-Jewish in his writings. While religious hostilities intensified, the aging humanist echoed Knox’s argument that linked the Catholic enemy with the Jewish crucifiers of Christ. When the radical Calvinist Andrew Melville returned to Scotland from Geneva in 1574, he persuaded the kirk to fully embrace Presbyterianism; moreover, he determined to eradicate the remaining vestiges of Popery from the kirk. However, Melville was a learned Hebraist, who gradually modified the anti-Semitic influence of Knox. Having studied Hebrew in France and Switzerland, Melville brought to Scotland Reuchlin’s Hebrew dictionary, writings of Abraham Ibn Ezra, works attributed to Solomon, and other Judaica—which he utilized in harangues against the deposed Queen Mary and the Catholic church.

Andrew’s nephew James Melville was delighted at his uncle’s revival of Hebrew scholarship, and he became his devoted pupil. The Protestant rehabilitation of Jewish studies may also have provided a bridge by which Catholic craftsmen, initially loyal to Queen Mary, gradually accepted the Reformed faith. In James Melville’s diary, there is a provocative account of a working stonemason, William Erde, who learned to read Hebrew so well that he was eventually “maid to leave his handie craft” to train as a minister for the Presbyterian church.¹⁴ Erde evidently continued to attend lodge meetings, and the Melvilles would later give refuge to him and another mason, “his fellow laborar,” when they were persecuted by authorities. Perhaps it was Erde who produced the Hebrew manuscripts later found among a cache of old masonic documents, which were mentioned in an Aberdeen text of 1670.¹⁵ Given the Melvilles’ interest in Reuchlin, Erde may also have infused the German’s Christian-Cabalistic conception of the “wonder-working Word” into masonic

¹³ Roger Lockyer, *James VI and I* (London: Longmans, 1998), 10–11.

¹⁴ James Melville, *The Diary of Mr. James Melville, 1556–1601* (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, MDCCCXXXIX), 145–46.

¹⁵ J. Anderson, *Constitutions* (1738), 375.

rituals. In Reuchlin's *De Verbo Mirifico* (1494), the magical word was IH SUH, the Pentagrammaton, by which man performs miracles and achieves "an internal mystical union" with God.¹⁶ This tradition would later emerge in eighteenth-century Jacobite lodges.

During James VI's childhood, he shared his classroom with a remarkable group of students, who drew upon Cabalistic and Hermetic traditions despite the disapproval of their tutor Buchanan. In 1675 one classmate, the fifteen year-old prodigy James Crichton, must have impressed the nine year-old king with his astounding expertise in the Art of Memory and his fluency in twelve languages (including Hebrew, Chaldaic, Greek, and German). Besides his brilliance in mathematics and astrology, Crichton possessed "a thorough knowledge of the Cabala" and "the recondite sciences."¹⁷ According to Tytler, during Crichton's early education, he was influenced by authors who traced "an intimate relation between the doctrines of the Jewish Rabbis and the philosophy of Pythagoras "and who "invented a strange and mystical system of Platonicism united to ideas and principles which were borrowed from the Cabala." Crichton was especially influenced by Cardano's encyclopedic interests and techniques of Memory, and his charismatic personality probably effected the young king's penchant for study and determination to develop an expert memory. James's precocious feats of memory would soon elicit praise from foreign observers.

Another student was George Erskine of Innerteil, whose lifelong fascination with the Cabalistic and Hermetic sciences was rooted in his early studies. As we shall see, Erskine and Crichton would later develop contacts with personages important to the Rosicrucian movement. However, like their royal classmate, Crichton and Erskine eventually resented Buchanan's narrow Presbyterianism and turned to Europe for further illumination. Crichton rejected his father's Reformist beliefs and remained stubbornly Catholic, which led to his exit from Buchanan's tutelage and to subsequent residence on the Continent, where his physical and mental exploits won him the title of "the Admirable Crichton." We will deal with the careers of these early "illuminists" later, but it is significant that the young king's

¹⁶ P. Maxwell-Stuart, "De Verbo Mirifico," 206.

¹⁷ Patrick Tytler, *Life of the Admirable Crichton*, 2nd rev. ed. (Edinburgh: W. and C. Tart, 1823), 81, 118, 227-29.

determination to broaden his intellectual and spiritual horizons was shared by his classmates.

James's favorite companion in study was his governor's son, John Erskine, later Sixth Earl of Mar, whom the king fondly called "Jock o' the slaitties" (slate chalk boards) because of his "unnatural interest in mathematics."¹⁸ James shared that interest, and he remained a lifelong friend and admirer of Mar. At this time, Mar *père* undertook restoration work on various private edifices, and he was "well-placed to exploit the service of the best architects and craftsmen."¹⁹ Thus, young Jock received paternal and masonic reinforcement for his mathematical studies. Buchanan, through his work on *De Sphaera*, was an able tutor in the subject, and he probably learned from his Familist contacts about Guy Le Fèvre de la Boderie's publication, *La Galliade ou de la revolution des arts et sciences* (1578), which argued that the builders of the Gothic cathedrals "employed an eastern treasure of sacred geometry drawn from the Pythagorean school," which in turn drew on Hebrew mathematical lore.²⁰

However, Buchanan became increasingly preoccupied with Presbyterian polemics and the writing of two political-historical treatises, *De Jure Regni apud Scotiae* and *Rerum Scoticarum Historiae*, which Plantin hoped to publish at the Golden Compasses. By the time they appeared posthumously in 1582, it was clear that Buchanan's partisan views had taken him far away from Familist notions of religious tolerance and mystical mathematics. Differing from earlier nationalist historians, he rejected the Egyptian-Mosaic tradition of Gathelus and Scota and scorned the architectural achievements of Stewart kings (lumping the "useless building" of royal palaces and monasteries with the "ludicrous expenses" of masques and tournaments).²¹ Ill-tempered and impatient, he created such an unhappy atmosphere that his precocious royal pupil became increasingly receptive to new influences from a more eclectic intellectual world.

Some access to that world was provided by the regent Morton, who "although a Calvinist in theology, was Erastian by tempera-

¹⁸ David Mathew, *James I* (Tuscaloosa: Alabama UP, 1968), 25.

¹⁹ A. MacKechnie, "James VI's Architects," 155-58.

²⁰ See Susanna Akerman, *Rose Cross Over the Baltic: the Spread of Rosicrucianism in Northern Europe* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 33, 186.

²¹ C. McKean, "Hamilton of Finnart," 143; George Buchanan, *The History of Scotland*, 7th ed., trans. Bond (Glasgow: Chapman and Laing, 1799), I, 58, 106-07.

ment."²² He became increasingly disgusted with Andrew Melville's attempt to make Scotland a theocracy in which final authority would reside in the general assembly of the kirk. Scorning Melville's "over-seas dreams [and] imitation of Geneva discipline and laws," Morton took refuge from religious disputes in his building projects, which drew on older Scottish traditions and current European developments. Howard notes that the crusty courtier was "an enthusiastic patron of architecture in private as well as public life," and he implemented innovative Renaissance and Continental features in his edifices.²³

In April 1579 Morton appointed Sir Robert Drummond of Carnock as King's Master of Works, and he undertook a policy of extensive architectural repair despite iconoclastic opposition. MacKechnie suggests that his work combined operative masonic and architectural designing skills.²⁴ Perhaps the association of Morton and Drummond with masonic craftsmen reinforced their interest in Scotland's Egyptian-Hebraic traditions, for six months later they oversaw the royal entry when "the young godly prince" came of age in October.²⁵ In "a rare appearance of an iconic figure," which had not been used since 1560, Dame Scotia appeared on the steps of St. Giles church in the guise of Dame Religion and addressed the king in Hebrew. Further along, the Greco-Egyptian astronomer and mathematician Ptolemy interpreted the conjunction of the planets at James's birth and invited the young king into "the magico-scientific world of the northern Renaissance."²⁶ Additional Hebraic imagery suggested that "the young David had already become Solomon."

In that same year, Morton moderated his treatment of James and, recognizing the youth's appetite for learning, arranged for him to receive the surviving books of his mother's library. The regent had finally retrieved them from her old enemy, Sir James Sandilands, who had looted them "from the wreck of the Queen's moveables at Holyrood."²⁷ As noted earlier, Mary's rich library contained many works of the Hermetic and Cabalistic revival in France, as well as

²² R. Lockyer, *James VI and I*, 11.

²³ D. Howard, *Scottish Architecture*, 35, 58, 83–84.

²⁴ A. MacKechnie, "James VI's Architects," 159.

²⁵ Michael Lynch, "A Nation Born Again? Scottish Identity in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," in D. Broun, *Image and Identity*, 86–87.

²⁶ Michael Lynch, "Court Ceremony and Ritual during the Personal Reign of James VI," in J. Goodare, *Reign*, 78.

²⁷ J. Robertson, *Inventaires*, cii.

crusader histories and irenic religious tracts. From his later writings, it is clear that James VI found these works eye-opening and inspirational. The once-intimidated adolescent was soon to become “the most learned and intellectually curious” monarch of the age.”²⁸ Most important to James was Lady Mar’s presentation to him of an encyclopedic and poetic work of architectural mysticism, the *Première Semaine*, by the French Protestant poet Guillaume de Salluste, Sieur Du Bartas. Determined to make the *Semaines* a new type of Hebraic religious epic, Du Bartas hoped to impress his Catholic contemporaries with his vision of “the God of the Psalms, the Great Avenger who moves in a cloud and speaks from a column of fire.”²⁹ But he also hoped to appeal to Protestants with his irenic vision, for he hated the wars of religion and was not inimical to Catholics.

From 1579 onward, James VI would be fascinated by Du Bartas’s “masonic” vision of a peaceful world ruled by Solomonic kings who worked together to rebuild the universal Temple. That the poet was actually associated with masonic enterprises in France would become important to James’s developing interest in the craft. In the *Première Semaine*, Du Bartas utilized a spatial, architectural structure and much masonic imagery to develop an encyclopedic and mystical description of the first week of Creation, according to *Genesis*. What is particularly striking in the poem is the profusion of practical details taken from the stonemason’s craft and architect’s training—details based on Du Bartas’s experience in working with the masons who expanded his château in 1567–69. He also participated in military masonry, especially in the design of fortifications. More importantly for his influence on the Scottish king, Du Bartas almost certainly participated in the masons’ secret meetings, for he revealed his intimate knowledge of the Solomonic traditions of the *compagnonnage*. In fact, almost every theme of Jewish, Hermetic, and neo-Platonic mysticism that emerges in seventeenth-century Freemasonry was powerfully articulated in the *Semaines*. Because James VI studied Du Bartas carefully, translated his poetry, and invited him to Edinburgh, an examination of the Frenchman’s writing throws new light on the transformation of medieval masonry into modern Freemasonry that occurred in Scotland in the 1590’s.

²⁸ M. Lee, *Great Britain’s Solomon*, 32.

²⁹ Sieur du Bartas, *The Works of Guillaume Salluste Sieur Du Bartas*, eds. U.T. Holmes, J.C. Lyons, and R.W. Linker (Chapel Hill: North Carolina UP, 1935), I, 118.

The *Semaines* were translated into English (as the *Divine Weeks and Works*) during James VI's reign, with the king contributing his own passages to the editions by Joshua Sylvester. Thus, it will be useful to quote from the English version, which had a profound impact on contemporary "masonic" thought. Du Bartas repeatedly described God as the "Architect devine," the "Arch-Architect," the "supreme peer-less architect," and "Heav'ns sacred Architect"—in phrases reminiscent of Plato in the *Timaeus* and Jewish authors of Cabalistic treatises.³⁰ While commenting on the Creation *ex nihilo* of *Genesis*, the poet revealed his own architectural experience:

As th' Architect that buildeth for a Prince
 Some stately Pallace; that he doo commence
 His Royall Worke, makes choise of such a Court
 Where cost and cunning equally consort:
 And, if he finde not in one Edifice
 All answerable to his quaint Device;
 From this faire Pallace then he takes his Front,
 From that his Finials; heer he learnes to mount
 His curious Staires, there findes he *Frise* and *Cornish*,
 And other Places other Peeces furnish;
 And so, selecting every where the best,
 Doth thirty models in one House digest.
 Nothing, but *Nothing* had the Lord Almightye,
 Whereof, wherewith, whereby to build this Citie . . .
 The Power and Will, th' affection and effect,
 The Worke and Project of this Architect
 March all at once: all to his Pleasure ranges,
 Who *Alwayes-One*, his purpose never changes.³¹

Then, in images that influenced James's growing sense of his role as God's vice-roy, Du Bartas argued that God created man in his own architectural image:

All th' admirable Creatures made beforne,
 Which Heav'n and Earth, and Ocean doo adorne,
 Are but Essaies, compar'd in everie part,
 To this devinest Maister-Piece of Art.
 Therefor the supreme peer-les Architect,
 When (of meere nothing) he did first erect,
 Heav'n Earth and Aire, and Seas; at once his thought

³⁰ Sieur Du Bartas, *The Divine Weeks and Works*, trans. Joshua Sylvester, ed. Susan Snyder (Oxford: Clarendon, 1979), I, 218, 275, 295, 328; II, 717.

³¹ *Ibid.*, I, 117.

His word, and deed all in an instant wrought.
 But, when he would his owne selfs Type create,
 Th' honour of Nature, th' Earths sole Potentate . . .
 And building of a second God of Earth . . .
 . . . he consults with's only Sonne,
 (His owne true Pourtrait) what proportion,
 What gifts, what grace, what soule he should bestow
 Upon his *Vice-Roy* of this Realme below . . .
 Admired Artist, Architect devine,
 Perfect and peer-les in all Works of thine,
 So my rude hand on this rough Table guid
 To paint the Prince of all thy works beside,
 That grave Spectators, in his face may spie
 Apparant marks of thy Devinitie.³²

Du Bartas used the words "Essaies" and "Maister-Piece" in their operative masonic sense, as the architectural demonstration models required in the training and elevation of craft apprentices.³³

Elaborating on the theme of man as microcosm, Du Bartas provided further evidence of his architectural and masonic experience:

For in Man's self is Fire, Aire, Earth, and Sea,
 Man's (in a word) the World's Epitome,
 Or little map, which heere my Muse doth trie
 By the grand Patterne to exemplifie.
 A wittie Mason, doth (with rare art)
 Into a Pallace, *Paros* Rocks convert,
 Seele it with gold, and to the Firmament,
 Raise the proud Turrets of his Battlement,
 And (to be briefe) in everie part of it,
 Beautie to use, use unto beautie fit . . .
 Can everie-where admire with due respect
 Th' admired Art of such an Architect.³⁴

Like the Jewish God of the *Sepher Yetzirah* and the *Zohar* (works studied by Du Bartas), the poem's God is "a good Artizan," who can aptly manage "Good or bad Toolles."³⁵ In a section called "The Handy-Crafts," God speaks to the poet's "prentize eare," while the poet works as a "mortall builder" with "Levell, Compass, Rule, and Squire."

³² Ibid., I, 275-76.

³³ For the masons' "master piece," see D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 41, 46.

³⁴ Du Bartas, *Divine Weeks*, I, 274.

³⁵ Ibid., I, 199, 396; II, 490.

For James, who had to deal with dissident Protestant stonemasons such as Erde and his "fellow laborar," Du Bartas's descriptions of the rebellious masons who built the Tower of Babel must have been instructive:

Bring me (quoth one) a trowell, quicklie, quicke;
 One brings him up a hammer: heaw this bricke,
 Another bids, and then they cleave a tree;
 Make fast this rope, and then they let it flee:
 One calls for planckes, another mortar lackes,
 They beare the first, a stone; the last, an axe . . .
 In breefe, as those, that in some channell deepe
 Begin to build a bridge with arches steepe . . .
 These Masons so, seeing the storme arrived
 Of Gods just wrath, all weake, and hart-deprived,
 Forsake their purpose, and like frantike fooles
 Scatter their stuffe, and tumble downe their tooles.
 O proud revolt! O traiterous felony!³⁶

In a long section on the building of Solomon's Temple, Du Bartas drew on Jewish and Arabic mystical lore that made "*wit-wondrous Salomon*" a great visionary and magician:

King SALOMON, awaked, plainly knew
 That this Divine Strange *Vision* never grew
 From the sweet Temper of his sound Complexion;
 But that it was some Peece of more perfection,
 Some sacred Picture admirably draw'n
 With Heavenly pencil, by an Angels hand . . .
 . . . up to Heav'n he flies,
 Hee dyves to Hell, he sounds the Deeps, hee enters
 To th' inmost Cels of the Worlds lowest Centers.
 The secret Riddles of the sacred Writ
 Are plain to him, and his deep-piercing Wit . . .³⁷

When Solomon set to work on the Temple, he employed all his magical and intellectual skills and soon recruited "the wittiest Architects":

Millions of hands be busie labouring . . .
 Great Rocks made little, what with Sawes and Hammers:
 The sturdy Quar-man with steel-headed Cones
 And massie Sledges slenteth out the Stones,

³⁶ Ibid. II, 437.

³⁷ Ibid., II, 673.

Digs through the bowels of th'earth baked stiff,
 Cuts a wide Window through a horned Cliff
 Of ruddy Porphire, or white Alabaster,
 And masters Marble, which no Time can Master.
 One melts the White-stone with the force of fire:
 Another, level'd by the *Lesbian* Squire,
 Deep under ground (for the Foundation) joynes
 Wel-polisht Marble, in long massie Coines;
 Such both for stuff, and for rare artifice,
 As mought beseeem some royall Frontispiece.
 This heaws a Chapter; that a Frize doth frame;
 This Carves a Cornich; that prepares a Jambe,
 This formes a Plynth; that fits an Architrave;
 This planes a Plank; and that the same doth grave . . .

.....
 Great King, whence came this Courage (Titan-like)
 So many Hills to heap upon a rick?
 What mightie Rowlers, and what massie Cars
 Could bring so far so many monstrous Quars?
 And, what huge strength of hanging Vaults embow'd
 Bears such a waight above the winged Clowde?

 If on the out-side I doo cast mine eye,
 The Stones are joyn'd so artificially,
 That if the Maçon had not checkered fine,
Syre's Alabaster with hard Serpentine,
 And hundred Marbles no lesse fair than firm;
 The whole, a whole Quar one might rightly term.³⁸

In a section called "The Columnes," Du Bartas further suggested his own experiences among working masons. Expanding Josephus's account of the two pillars built by Seth, he added many details that occurred in the fifteenth-century Cooke masonic manuscript and that were later revealed as the oral traditions of the *compagnonnage*. Significantly, Du Bartas argued that these masonic traditions were preserved and transmitted by the Jewish Cabalists:

Old *Seth* (saith *Heber*) *Adams* Scholler yerst
 (Who was the Scholler his Maker first)
 Having attain'd to know the course and scites,
 Th' aspect and greatnes of Heav'ns glistring Lights;
 He taught his Children, whose industrious wit
 Through dilligence trew excellent in it . . .
 And on their Grand-sires firme and goodly ground

³⁸ Ibid., II, 693–94.

A sumptuous building they in time doo found.
 But (by tradition *Cabalistike*) taught
 That God would twice reduce this World to nought,
 By *Flood* and *Flame*; they reared cunningly
 This stately payre of *Pillars*, which you see:
 Long-time safe-keeping for their after Kin,
 A hundred learned Misteries therein.³⁹

The frontispiece to the 1613 English edition featured two pillars topped with globes, an emblem which later surfaced in documents of Freemasonry.⁴⁰

Discovered within the pillar is an ever-burning lamp, which illuminates a series of mysterious hieroglyphs and emblematic tools. Asking "What Toolcs are these? what devine secrets lie/Hidden within this learned Myserie?," Du Bartas answered with a long, complex rhapsody on the mystical significance of numbers, which drew heavily on the *Sepher Yetzirah* and Cabalistic lore. He was fully cognizant of the sexual symbolism of male and female numbers ("The Criticall and double-sexed Seven") and of the magical powers attributed to various geometric configurations. That these mysterious arts and powers were the possession of architects and masons was clearly proclaimed:

... it is *Geometrie*,
 The Crafts-mans guide, Mother of *Symetrie*,
 The Life of Instruments of rare effect,
 Law of that Law which did the World erect.
 Heere's nothing heere, but *Rules*, *Squires*, *Compasses*,
Waightes, *Measures*, *Plommets*, *Figures*, *Ballances*.
 Lo where the Work-man with a stedic hand
 Ingeniously a levell *Lyne* hath drawne,
 War-like *Triangles*, building-fit *Quadrangles*,
 And hundred kindes of Formes of *Manie-Angles*
Straight, *Broad*, and *Sharpe* ...

 More-over, as the Building *Ambligone*
 May more receive then Mansions *Oxigone* ...
 So does the *Circle* in his Circuit span
 More roome then any other *Figure* can ...

³⁹ Ibid., II, 468–89.

⁴⁰ See note by John Hamill (*AQC*, 103 (1990), 261), where he observes that Du Bartas's pillars and masonic imagery seem "to foreshadow" modern Freemasonry.

Chiefly (my *Phalec*) hether bend thy minde,
 And learne Two Secrets which but few shall finde,
 Two busie knots, Two laberinths of doubt,
 Where future Schooles shall wander long about,
 Beating their braines, their best endeavours troubling:
 The *Circles* Squarenes, and the *Cubes* re-doubling.⁴¹

Du Bartas then referred to the Art of Memory as the necessary tool to penetrate these mathematical and architectural mysteries:

Print ever faster in thy faithfull braine
 Then on brasse leaves, these *Problems* proved plaine,
 Not by Sophistike subtle Arguments,
 But even by practise and experience:
 Un-disputable Art, and fruitfull Skill,
 Which with new wonders all the World shall fill.⁴²

In the “The Handy-Crafts” section, he had earlier referred to the “brasse leaves ingrav’n eternally/In the bright Temple of faire *Memorie*.”⁴³

That the Art of Memory included Cabalistic visualization techniques was further revealed in his description of Moses’s vision of the architectural design of the Tabernacle: “While with the Duke [Moses] th’ Eternall did devise,/And to his inward sight did mod-elize/His *Tabernacle*’s admirable Form.”⁴⁴ The mnemonic-visualization techniques could also produce the power of second sight: “our thoughts internal eye,/Things past and present may by meanes descrie.” This is achieved “by a cleere and certaine pre-science.”⁴⁵ That James VI’s royal architect would later require that all masons be trained in the “art and science” of Memory suggests a Du Bartasan influence. We shall return to the *Divine Weeks* when we examine additional Cabalistic and architectural themes that became significant in Scottish Freemasonry. In the meantime, it is important to keep in mind James VI’s fascination with Du Bartas’s masonic vision, as the king undertook important new political initiatives.

In the same year, 1579, when James first read Du Bartas and his mother’s Hermetic volumes, his cousin Esmé Stuart, Seigneur

⁴¹ Du Bartas, *Divine Weeks*, II, 472–73.

⁴² *Ibid.*, II, 473.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, I, 381.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 576–77.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 397.

d'Aubigny, arrived in Edinburgh as an agent of the Guise supporters of Queen Mary. The Frenchman's influence on the young king soon provoked concern among radical Protestants. As Donaldson observes, "A man in his late thirties, acquainted with the ways of a world wider than the Scottish court," Esmé Stuart won the affection of an adolescent king "who had never known parental care and whose nature had been warped by those who taught him to hate and despise his mother."⁴⁶ In this first passionate friendship, James initiated a pattern that he would repeat with his later "favorites" in England. However, the assumption by many modern historians that these were carnally homosexual relationships rests on little evidence and on an anachronistic interpretation of the non-sexual cult of male friendship which flourished among idealistic intellectuals.⁴⁷ Because similarly inaccurate charges of homosexuality would later be made against the Freemasons, a brief examination of James's case will be relevant to that controversy.

In a new medical analysis, the physician A.W. Beasley argues that James's physical peculiarities—his overlarge tongue and tendency to slobber, his fidgeting fingers and odd circular gait, his frequent embraces and leanings on young men—were caused by a mild case of cerebral palsy.⁴⁸ Even James's Puritan enemy, Sir Anthony Weldon, admitted that,

... his legs were very weake, having had (as was thought) some foul play in his youth, or rather before he was born, that he was not able to stand at seven years of age, that weaknesse made him ever leaning on other mens shoulders...⁴⁹

Beasley further suggests that James's "wistful envy of well-proportioned male physique" was rooted in his own "disability."⁵⁰

Though Presbyterian critics of the adolescent king's affection for his French cousin lamented the latter's influence, there was no hint of homosexuality in the detailed descriptions of James recorded in

⁴⁶ G. Donaldson, *Scotland*, 173.

⁴⁷ For an important revisionist argument for the non-sexual relationship of James and his favorites, see M. Lee, *Great Britain's Solomon*, 232–60.

⁴⁸ A.W. Beasley, "The Disability of James VI and I," *The Seventeenth Century*, 10 (1995), 160.

⁴⁹ Sir Anthony Weldon, *The Court and Character of King James* (London, 1651); reprinted in Walter Scott, ed., *Secret History of the Court of James the First* (Edinburgh: John Ballantyne, 1811), II, 2.

⁵⁰ A. Beasley, "Disability," 160.

1584 and 1586; in fact, he was described as “very chaste and yet desirous of marriage.”⁵¹ That he would later shock his Danish bride-to-be with his impulsive and emotional kisses was consistent with his frank and public expressions of affection to both sexes.⁵² In 1596, in a work dedicated to his son Henry, he would classify sodomy among the “horrible crimes that ye are bound in conscience never to forgive.”⁵³ James’s later homophilic language would be directed to his son Charles as well as his favorite Buckingham, and it would be echoed in the correspondence of definitely heterosexual Freemasons in the 1650’s.⁵⁴

Meanwhile, encouraged by Esmé Stuart, James began to reject the narrow theological world of Knox and the partisan polemics of Buchanan; he now aspired to the role of “universal king,” who would conciliate religious and political parties in the name of absolute monarchy. With the death of Buchanan in 1580, James was eager to learn more about his relatives abroad and about the intellectual developments in France that could produce a great poet like Du Bartas. To honour his new mentor, James made Stuart Duke of Lennox and granted him valuable positions and properties, including the former Templar lands at Temple Newsom outside Leeds.⁵⁵

During these happy days, there was a renewal for a brief season of the Continental influences which had pervaded his mother’s court, and James VI enjoyed “the first circle of literary *italianisants* in Scotland.”⁵⁶ At this time, his former classmate Crichton was in Italy, where he performed prodigious feats of Memory that included learned discourses in eleven languages on subjects from theology to mathematics. A brilliant swordsman and master of chivalric arts, the charismatic Scot seemed the embodiment of Lull’s illuminated knight. Crichton’s blazing star shed a flattering light on the intellectual court

⁵¹ Jenny Wormald, “James VI and I: Two Kings or One?”, *History*, 68 (1983), 188n.2.

⁵² See David Stevenson, *Scotland’s Last Royal Wedding: The Marriage of James VI and Anne of Denmark* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1997).

⁵³ *Basilikon Doron*; reprinted in *The Political Works of James I*, ed. C.H. McIlwain (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1918), 20.

⁵⁴ See Chapter Nine.

⁵⁵ “Processus Factus contra Templarios in Scotia,” *The Spottiswoode Miscellany* (Edinburgh: Spottiswoode Society, 1865), II, 10.

⁵⁶ William Fowler, *The Works of William Fowler*, ed. H.W. Meikle, J. Craigie, and J. Purves (Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1940), I, cviii, cxiv.

of James VI, who welcomed scholars with Italian-French connections, despite criticism from the Presbyterian kirk.

Among the new courtiers was Mark Kerr, the Catholic Earl of Lothian, who was kinned to the St. Clairs of Roslin and who shared their interest in emblematic architecture.⁵⁷ While studying the occult sciences in Padua and Paris, Kerr became fascinated by the Art of Memory. After returning to Scotland, he undertook the renovation of Prestongrange House, where in 1581 he supervised the decorative painting of a large ceiling, which featured a plethora of complex, bizarre, and phallic emblems. Cowan suggests that the ceiling functioned as a "memory chart," which used striking images ("beautiful or hideous, comic or obscene") to stimulate the full powers of Memory.⁵⁸ Since 1475 painters in Scotland were members of the Incorporation of Masons and Wrights.⁵⁹ Because ceiling painters had to work closely with the master masons who supervised Scottish building projects, the Prestongrange designs hint that the Art of Memory was currently known to some Scottish masons. When James VI appointed Kerr as Master of Requests, he perhaps gained new access to the Italian techniques of Memory that Cardano had earlier brought to his grandmother's court.

The Kerr family were supporters of the Duke of Lennox, who became *de facto* leader of the Scottish government, and they encouraged James to feel more sympathy for the plight of his mother, who languished in an English prison. Though Lennox professed the Reformed faith while in Scotland, many Presbyterians feared that he was a secret Catholic and that James was now collaborating with Queen Mary to restore the old religion. In 1581 the king and duke tried to allay these fears by signing the "King's Confession," which systematically repudiated the Papacy and reaffirmed Scotland's Hebraic role as preserver of the "true religion." Williamson notes that "instead of a mere abjuration of Roman Catholicism, the oath became a covenant involving the full-hearted consent of the people and king,

⁵⁷ The name is spelled both Ker and Kerr; see James B. Paul, ed., *The Scots Peerage* (Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1908), V, 453–57.

⁵⁸ Edward Cowan, "The Darker Vision of the Scottish Renaissance," in Ian Cowan and Duncan Shaw, eds., *The Renaissance and Reformation in Scotland* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1983), 139–40.

⁵⁹ Michael Baigent, "The Painting of the 'Judgement of Solomon' at Culross 'Palace,'" *AQC*, 106 (1993), 160.

whose act, in unison with God, bore a genuine resemblance to the Jewish experience.”⁶⁰

This Jewish idea of kingship and covenant would ramify into James’s later relation to Freemasonry. However, in 1582, nothing would satisfy the radical Presbyterians except the capture of the king and the expulsion of Lennox, who returned to France in December and died in May 1583. The odd tradition that surfaced in early eighteenth-century Freemasonry that Aubigny—Lennox’s home territory—preserved ancient Scottish masonic traditions may have descended from the seigneur’s short-lived but happy collaboration with James VI. After the death of Lennox and James’s release from captivity, a shaken king announced in July 1583 that he was determined to “draw his nobility to unity and concord and to be known as a universal king.”⁶¹ He now took as his motto, “Blessed are the peacemakers.” In order to implement a *via media* between Scotland’s religious and aristocratic factions, he also declared “a preference for reliance on men of middle class origins and intention to make service, rather than birth, the path to advancement.”

Like his grandmother Mary of Guise and his poetic hero Du Bartas, James apparently saw in masonry a means of bringing about religious conciliation and spiritual renewal. This new policy perhaps explains the removal of Drummond of Carnock from his lifetime appointment as Master of Works, for his sons were suspected of treasonous activities during the king’s imprisonment. However, Drummond would earn a reputation for his “God-given gifts of architectural and landscaping skills,” and his interests would be passed on to his poetic grandson, William Drummond of Hawthornden.⁶² On 21 December 1583 the king named a new Master of Works, William Schaw, a moderate and private Catholic, who would counter the influence of the extremist Presbyterians.⁶³

Schaw’s ancestors were associated with Hamilton of Finnart’s architectural projects, and his parents developed close connections with the court of Mary of Guise, where young William probably served as a royal page.⁶⁴ As a member of the land-owning class, Schaw was

⁶⁰ A. Williamson, *Scottish National Consciousness*, 68.

⁶¹ G. Donaldson, *Scotland*, 187, 217–18.

⁶² A. MacKechie, “James VI’s Architects,” 159–61.

⁶³ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 27–28.

⁶⁴ J. Cameron, *James V*, 201.

not a master craftsman but had become knowledgeable about architectural design and technology. James granted him extensive powers, naming him "great master of all and sundry of his highness's palaces, buildings, and reparations, and great overseer, director, and commander" of royal works.⁶⁵ As we shall see, Schaw would also undertake a major reorganization of the masonic craft, "organizing a national system of lodges for the first time," and virtually creating modern Freemasonry.

When he appointed Schaw, James was translating Du Bartas's poem, *Uranie*, and he perhaps hoped that his new Master of Works could play the role of Bezalel and Hiram as expressed by "masonic" poet and "Solomonic" king:

... *Hirams* holy help it war unknowne
 What he in building *Izraels* Temple had showne,
 Without Gods Ark *Beseleel* Jewe had bene
 In everlasting silence buried clene.
 Then, since the bewty of those works most rare
 Hath after death made live all them that ware
 Their builders; though them selves with tyme be failde,
 By spoils, by fyres, by warres, and tempests quailde.⁶⁶

The original French phrases of Du Bartas are especially apt for William Schaw, about whom little is known until his appointment as royal architect: "*Hiram seroit sans nom, sans la sainte assistance/ Qu'il fit au bastiment du temple d'Israel.*" Lockyer notes that James now "broke with recent precedent by reviving the fortunes and activities of the royal masons."⁶⁷

Despite Schaw's personal Catholic beliefs, he had signed the "King's Confession," and its Judaized covenant accorded well with the Jewish traditions of masonry. Though he was closely associated with the Catholic Seton and St. Clair families, Schaw was not interested in persecuting religious dissidents, such as the stonemasons who sought refuge with James Melville. Thus, he represented the tolerant religious views which the king was determined to maintain, while he strove to pacify and unify Scotland. Perhaps the Master of Works, like the king, was influenced by Du Bartas's "masonic" conception

⁶⁵ M. Glendinning, *History*, 38; my modernization of spelling.

⁶⁶ James VI, *The Poems of James VI of Scotland*, ed. James Craigie (Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1955), I, 31-32.

⁶⁷ R. Lockyer, *James VI and I*, 172.

of the Jewish covenant, which the poet attributed to Solomon as he designed the Temple:

This *TEMPLE*, where such Wealth and Order meet,
 This Art in every part, cannot proceed
 But from one Pattern; and that but from one
 Author of all, who all preserves alone.
 Else should we see in set Batalions
 A hundred thousand furious Partizans,
 The World would nource civill intestine Wars,
 And wrack it self in it selfs faction Jars.

 This Sacred House so fair . . .
 Is not, to contain God, but godly men
 Which worship him: and, wee doo not suppose
 That Hee, whose Arms doo Heav'n and Earth inclose,
 Is closed in a Chest; but th' ancient Pact,
 The solemne Covenant, and the sure Contract,
 Which leagues us with our God, and each with other,
 And (holy bond) hold Heaven and Earth together.⁶⁸

Like other traditionalists and Catholics, Schaw shared the king's determination to reduce the influence of radical Protestants and their English supporters; thus, they sought a renewal of the "auld alliance" with France. In January 1584 James asked Schaw to accompany Lord George Seton and his son Alexander to Paris in order to renew previous treaties of friendship.⁶⁹ The subsequent collaboration of Schaw and Seton *filis* would prove important for masonic affairs. Glendinning observes that,

As a closet Roman Catholic, who had received a clerical education by Jesuits in Rome and who had studied law in France, [Alexander] Seton was part of that world of liberal, Europe-wide cultural exchange which was now threatened by political and religious polarisations.⁷⁰

George and Alexander Seton were kinned to the late David Seton, who died in exile as the titular Grand Prior of the Scottish Hospitallers, and they shared the family's interest in chivalric orders. Thus, it is relevant to masonic developments that the Setons and Schaw hoped to persuade Henri III to reorganise the Scots Guard, which was now commanded by a Frenchman rather than the traditional Scot. Lord

⁶⁸ Du Bartas, *Divine Weeks*, 700.

⁶⁹ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 28–29, 90–96.

⁷⁰ M. Glendinning, *History*, 41.

Seton urged the appointment of his son or another Scot, and Henri III agreed to name a member of the Franco-Scottish Lennox family to the post.⁷¹ As noted earlier, some kind of "neo-Templar" initiation was required in the Guard, and Seton's descendants would claim in the nineteenth-century that their family long served as hereditary protectors of the quasi-Masonic Order of the Temple—a role perhaps encouraged by the Setons and Schaw during their mission to Paris in 1584.

It was apparently during this trip that Schaw and the younger Seton studied French buildings and determined to implement a new architectural and masonic policy in Scotland. After Schaw's death in 1602, Seton contributed to his epitaph, which suggested that "his true-hearted friend" extended his architectural studies to other European countries: "In his eagerness to improve his mind he travelled through France and many other kingdoms. Accomplished in every liberal art, he excelled in architecture."⁷² As part of that intellectual improvement and their royalist mission, Schaw and Seton may have contacted Du Bartas and his circle, who held the keys to the masonic Art of Memory.

James VI had learned more about the Art from Cardano's writings, which he drew upon for his poetic compositions at this time.⁷³ With his new sympathy for his grandmother and mother, who both admired Cardano, he would be increasingly receptive to the Cabalistic and Hermetic lore patronized by the Guises and collected by Queen Mary. In his current poetry, James referred to Hermes Trismegistus, whose role as inventor of all arts and sciences was praised in the French edition of the *Poemander* he acquired from his mother's library.⁷⁴ James's interest in the Art of Memory received additional stimulus from the poet William Fowler, whose father had worked closely with Mary of Guise at the time of Cardano's visit to her court.⁷⁵ Like

⁷¹ B. Seton, *House*, I, 362–63.

⁷² D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 26–27.

⁷³ James VI, *New Poems of James I of England*, ed. Allan Westcott (New York: AMS Press, 1966), xxi–xxii, 80–81. James also referred to his readings of Cardano in *Daemonologie* (1597); see *Minor Prose Works of James VI and I*, eds. James Craigie and Alexander Law (Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society, 1982), 9.

⁷⁴ James VI, *Poems*, 315; George Warner, ed., *The Library of James VI, 1573–1583*. Miscellanies of Scottish Historical Society, XV (Edinburgh UP, 1893), xliii.

⁷⁵ William Fowler, *The Works of William Fowler*, ed. Henry Meikle, James Craigie, and John Purvis (Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1940), III, x, xxix.

Schaw, Fowler attended the court as a child and may have been impressed by Cardano's boasted expertise in the Lullist art. James collaborated with Fowler in literary studies, and the poet later recorded on a manuscript that "while I was teaching your majesty the art of memory, you instructed me in poesie."⁷⁶ Fowler also listed an "Art of Memory" (now lost) among his writings.

In 1584 James demonstrated his interest in architecture and his collaboration with Schaw, when he ordered Chancellor Arran to add an upper storey to the gateway of Edinburgh castle. The royal arms were framed within a "pedimented aedicule," while its "correctly detailed Ionic order and design recalling the Pantheon altars" suggest that Schaw was the architect.⁷⁷ In the same year, James published a collection of his verse called *The Essayes of a Prentice, in the Devine Art of Poesie*, in which he drew on his familiarity with masonry. Like Du Bartas, the king used the words essay and apprentice with full cognizance of their role in an initiatory masonic process. Moreover, this apprenticeship was the first step towards gaining expertise in Cabalistic linguistic, masonic, and spiritual capacities.

Du Bartas affirmed the sacred value of poetic composition, for "only man can talke of his Creator,/Of heaven, and earth, and fire, and ayre, and water,/... In choise sweet-termes." Because of the poet's religious role, he should model his use of language on that of the ancient Hebrews:

Now, when I note how th' Hebrew brevity,
Even with few words expresseth happily
Deepest conceites . . .

.....
When I remember, how the *Rabbins* set
Out of the sacred Hebrue Alphabet
All that our faith beleeves, or eyes behold;
That in the law, the Arts are all inrold:
Whether with curious paine, we do transport
Her letters turn'd in many-various sort
(For as in cifering, th' only transportation
Of figures, still varies their valuation:
So th' *anagram* strenthens, or slacks a name,
Giving a secret twist unto the same)
Or whether we (even as in *grosse*) bestowing

⁷⁶ Ibid., III, xix n.4: II, 168.

⁷⁷ D. Howard, *Scottish Architecture*, 35.

The numbers, which from one words letters flowing,
 Unfold a secret; and that word againe
 Another of like number doth containe:
 Or all a sentence in one word be shut:
 As *Egypt's* silence sealed-up mysterious
 In one character, a long sentence serious . . .⁷⁸

Du Bartas continued his praise of Cabalistic linguistic techniques, and he hinted at their connection with visualization techniques, for the "speech of heav'ns high king" reveals "spiritual pictures!" Du Bartas then identified the Cabalistic word builders with the masonic stone builders, whose Hebrew brethren preserved intact "this treasure" while the gentile brethren despoiled and divided it at the Tower of Babel: "the proud remnant of those scattered Masons/Had falsed it in hundred thousand fashions."⁷⁹ The current poverty of poetic language resulted from the false brethren, for "th' idle Mason hath but grossly hewd" in his linguistic constructions. When James used the word "essay" for his work of poetic apprenticeship, he knew that Scottish stonemasons had to perform an "essay"—i.e., make a design for a house to a given basic specification and construct a scale model—in order to achieve elevation in the fraternity.⁸⁰

While Du Bartas and James VI translated each other's poetry, the young king determined to regenerate both poetry and architecture in Scotland. Despite Knox's scorn for architectural beauty, many of the Reformers now lamented the sorry state of the Scottish churches. In 1584 James Melville noted that "the materiall Kirks lyes lyk sheipe and nout faulds rather than places of Christian congregationes to assemble into."⁸¹ While Melville sympathized with fugitive Protestant masons like Erde, the king must have looked upon them in Du Bartasan terms as contributing to the discords and divisions that turned Scotland into Babel. Thus, in late 1584, when the Setons and Schaw returned from France, he encouraged them to undertake ambitious new architectural projects.⁸² It was perhaps at this time that James and Schaw determined to revitalize the Art of Memory as a requirement of initiation in the masonic craft.

⁷⁸ Du Bartas, *Divine Weeks*, I, 431–32.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, I, 434.

⁸⁰ D. Stevenson, *First Freemasons*, 16.

⁸¹ George Hay, *The Architecture of Scottish Post-Reformation Churches* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1957), 20.

⁸² D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 28–30.

While Seton and Schaw were in France, there was a revival of interest in the Art of Memory, stimulated by the recent lectures and publications of the flamboyant Italian Hermeticist, Giordano Bruno. Yates notes that “Catholic Christian Hermetism was flourishing in French ecclesiastical circles” and at the court of Henri III.⁸³ Thus, the Scottish envoys probably heard about the French king’s interest in Bruno’s Art. Their interest would be further piqued by Bruno’s linkage of his mnemonic-visualization technique to his belief in an infinite universe, for he was heavily influenced by John Major, the Scottish scholar who earlier taught at the Sorbonne.⁸⁴ When the French king asked Bruno whether the Art was natural or done by magic, the Italian assured him that it was not magical. In fact, he argued that it provided tools to develop new inventions and practical sciences. Bruno dedicated his book on Memory, *De umbris idearum* (1582), to Henri III, who made him a royal reader. A second book on the Art, *Cantus Circaeus* (1582), was dedicated to Henri d’Angoulême, Grand Prior of France.

In these Parisian publications, Bruno presented a highly Cabalized version of the Lullist art, in which he assimilated the Lullian *dignitates* to the *sephiroth*. Léon-Jones notes that his charts of divine *sephiroth* and angelic names functioned like Lull’s memory wheels.⁸⁵ Though Bruno could not read Hebrew, he knew the Hebrew alphabet and had studied a Latin translation of Abulafia’s work on visionary techniques. Bruno believed that Solomon was a Cabalist, and he identified strongly with the Jewish king. In 1582 he also published *De compendiosa architectura artis Lullii*. Given Schaw’s interest in the art and science of Memory and his later determination to include its mastery in masonic training, it is significant that he probably encountered Bruno’s version of it in a form accepted by the “Most Christian King” of France.

Bearing letters of introduction from Henri III, Bruno visited London, where he stayed at the residence of the French ambassador Mauvissière from April 1583 to October 1585. Also visiting Mauvissière was the

⁸³ F. Yates, *Bruno*, 203.

⁸⁴ Hilary Gatti, *Giordano Bruno and Renaissance Science* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1999), 109–10, 184–85, 203–05.

⁸⁵ Karen Silvia de Léon-Jones, *Giordano Bruno and the Kabbalah: Prophets, Magicians, and Rabbis* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1997), 11–14, 44, 146. She argues that Yates ignores Bruno’s praise of rabbis and Cabalists and downplays the importance of Cabala to his philosophy.

Scottish poet William Fowler, James's instructor in Memory, who "haunts the ambassador's house practically every day."⁸⁶ In spring 1583 Fowler acted as a courier between Henri III, the dukes of Lennox and of Guise, King James, and the deposed Queen Mary. At the embassy he met Bruno, and it seems likely that both men used their expertise in Memory while they carried out secret diplomatic intrigues. Another Scot, Alexander Dickson, who had studied in France, now came to London where he became Bruno's intimate friend and ardent disciple.⁸⁷ The fact that Fowler was Protestant and Dickson Catholic points to the non-sectarian attractions of the Art of Memory among the Scottish intelligentsia. Bruno and Dickson were welcomed by the circle of Sir Philip Sidney, who had already expressed his interest in the Art of Memory and its relationship to the artifice and architecture of poetry (in his unpublished "Defence of Poetry," ca. 1580).⁸⁸

Given Sidney's interest in the role of poet as *vates* (diviner, foreseer, or prophet), he must have been fascinated by Bruno's extension of the classical Art into occultist realms.⁸⁹ Sidney probably heard from Dickson or Fowler, who also visited him, about James VI's interest in Memory. Sidney praised "King James of Scotland" as a contemporary patron of "Sweet poesy," undertook a correspondence with him, and shared his admiration for Du Bartas.⁹⁰ Unfortunately, Sidney's translation of the *Semaines* is lost. Like James and Du Bartas, Sidney was an advocate of religious conciliation and chivalric regeneration. In fact, Sidney's circle may have formed a kind of oath-bound fraternity, with "sworn brotherhood" in imitation of the crusading knights. Bruno enjoyed his reception by Sidney, Dickson, and their friends, and he confidently published another work in London, *Ars reminiscendi* (1583), which emphasized Lullian *architectura* while it further Cabalized the *dignitates*.

However, when Bruno visited Oxford, the Calvinist scholars scorned his heretical Hermetic-Lullist-Papist theosophy. Yates observes that

⁸⁶ W. Fowler, *Works*, III, xv–xvi; John Bossy, *Giordano Bruno and the Embassy Affair* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1991), 190–96.

⁸⁷ H. Gatti, *Bruno*, 180–81. His name was also spelled Dicson.

⁸⁸ See J.A. Van Dorsten, "The Arts of Memory and Poetry," *English Studies*, 48 (1967), 413–25.

⁸⁹ Philip Sidney, *Miscellaneous Prose of Sir Philip Sidney*, ed. Katherine Duncan-Jones and Jan Van Dorsten (Oxford: Clarendon, 1973), 76.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 110. Van Dorsten suggests that Sidney added the praise of James to the "Defence" after 1580.

the Oxonians viewed Bruno's Art as retrogressive medievalism, for "the English friars, with their memory 'pictures,' had certainly practised it."⁹¹ Now, the friars had been swept away and "their great houses were expropriated or in ruins." Bruno then used his *Dialoghi italiani* (London, 1584) to criticize the anti-architecture, anti-Memory attitudes of Oxford. In *La cena de la cenari*, he described a supper at Fulke Greville's house, with Sidney in attendance, in which he used the dilapidation of St. Paul's Cathedral as an example of Protestant England's national decay.⁹² In passages that would appeal to Scots such as Schaw and Seton (moderate Catholics devoted to the emblematic architecture of the Middle Ages and Renaissance), Bruno deplored the destruction of Catholic buildings during the iconoclastic fury of the Reformation.

At the same time, Bruno praised Dickson as "that learned, honourable, lovable, well-bred and very faithful friend . . . whom the Nolan [Bruno] loves as his own eyes."⁹³ Moreover, he made Dickson ("Dicsono Arelio") the mouthpiece for his own views throughout the dialogues. Bruno also expressed his scorn for a Scottish pedant at Oxford, one "Nundinio," who represented the views of the radical Calvinists. In 1584 Dickson wrote a defense of Bruno, *De umbra rationis*, which was published in London by Thomas Vautrollier, who also printed Bruno's *Spaccio della Bestia Triomphante* (1584) and *De gli Heroici Furori* (1585).⁹⁴ Because of Dickson's Catholicism and outspoken loyalty to Mary Queen of Scots, he was especially vulnerable to the attacks of English Protestants. Perhaps in reaction to the anti-Marian propaganda of Buchanan (who rejected the tradition of Scota, Gathelus, and the Egyptians in Scottish history), Dickson emphasized even more than Bruno the Egyptian character of the Art of Memory. James VI, who banned Buchanan's political works in 1584, would have been pleased at this *contretemps*. By tracing the transmission of the Art of Memory to Druids and Celts, Dickson rendered it more appealing to Scottish readers. He also went further than Bruno's published treatises in portraying the Art as a Hermetic cult.

However, Dickson's attack upon Ramist logic soon provoked a counter-blast from William Perkins, a Cambridge scholar, who deplored

⁹¹ F. Yates, *Art of Memory*, 261–62.

⁹² Vaughan Hart, *Art and Magic in the Court of the Stuarts* (London: Routledge, 1994), 182–83.

⁹³ John Durkan, "Alexander Dickson and S.T.C.," *The Bibliothek*, 3 (1962), 183–90.

⁹⁴ Joseph Ames, *Typographical Antiquities* (London: W. Faden, 1749), 352–56.

the sensuality of pictorial and architectural image-making and advocated "pure" logical rhetoric instead of the Art of Memory. Dickson replied under a pseudonym ("Heius Scepsius") and praised the Druids' capacity to memorize an enormous literature and the Pythagoreans' capacity to visualize complex mathematical formulations. Perkins would later argue that all works of imagination should be banned, because "A thing faigned in the mind by imagination is an idol." Yates stresses that,

We have to picture the controversy between Perkins and Dickson against the background of ruined buildings, smashed and defaced images—a background which loomed ever present in Elizabethan England. We must recreate the old mental habits, the art of memory as practised from time immemorial using the old buildings and the old images reflected within. The "Ramist man" must smash the images both within and without, must substitute for the old idolatrous art the new image-less way of remembering through abstract dialectical order.⁹⁵

As earlier, when advocates of French and Italian universalist Hermeticism found a receptive audience at the courts of Mary of Guise and Mary Queen of Scots, the English and Scottish advocates of the Art of Memory found refuge at the court of James VI. In 1584 Vautrollier fled London because of persecution brought on by his publication of Bruno's and Dickson's works.⁹⁶ He moved to Edinburgh, where he opened a publishing business and was welcomed by James's courtiers. In 1584 he printed an English translation of Wolfganus Musculus's *The Temporisour . . . or he that Changeth with the Time*, a work calculated to appeal to the king. He was then chosen to publish Thomas Hudson's English translation of Du Bartas's *Judith*—a translation produced at the request of the king. James was so impressed by Vautrollier's work that he commissioned him to print a new edition of *The Essayes of a Prentise in the Divine Art of Poesie* (1585) and *A Declaration of the King's Maiesties Intention and Meaning Towards the lait Actis of Parliament* (1585)—both bearing the imprint "cum privilegio regali."

By contrast in England, when Thomas Watson, a member of the Sidney circle, published *Compendium memoriae localis* (1585), he cautiously divested the Art from its Hermetic trappings. In the preface, Watson dissociated himself from Bruno and Dickson, noting that any

⁹⁵ F. Yates, *Art of Memory*, 278.

⁹⁶ J. Ames, *Typographical*, 352, 586–87.

comparison with their more learned and mystical works “may bring more infamy on the author than utility to the reader.” By late 1585, Bruno and Dickson had left England, but it is unclear where the Scot initially travelled. His subsequent employment by the Catholic earls in Scotland suggests that he returned home before travelling in Europe. When he appeared at James’s court in 1591, he was characterized as “master in the art of memory, and sometime attending on Mr. Philip Sidney, deceased.”⁹⁷ Dickson then became a close friend of Alexander Seton, who was undertaking extensive architectural work.⁹⁸

Given the interest of Seton, Schaw, and James in memory, architecture, and masonry in the mid-1580’s, it is interesting that a surviving record of Dickson’s instruction in the mnemonic art stresses its architectural imagery and method. Hugh Platt, an indefatigable inventor and advocate of experimental science, studied under Dickson in London and published an account of the simplified, non-mystical version of the Art of Memory revealed by the master:

You must make choice of some large edifice or building, whose Chambers or Galleries bee of some reasonable receipt, and so furnish unto you, as that everie part of each of them may present itself readily unto the eyes of your minde when you will call for them. In everie of these roomes you must place ten severall subjectes at a reasonable distance one from the other . . . Bothe forwarde and backward is easily brought to mind . . . These subjects shoulde bee such as as are most apt either to bee agents or patients, upon whatsoever you shall have cause to place them . . . and as Maister Dickson tearmed it, to animate the *umbras* or *ideas rerum memorandirani*. But herein everie man may best please his owne witte and memorie.⁹⁹

Though Platt was disappointed at the simplified version of the Art that he received, he granted its effectiveness in improving the memory for card-playing and story-telling. As a kinsman and friend of John Dee, the brilliant mathematician and astrologer to Queen Elizabeth, Platt recognized that Dickson (like Dee) had to be cautious in his teaching in order to avoid accusations of magical practice.¹⁰⁰ He

⁹⁷ *CSP. Relating to Scotland and Mary, Queen of Scots, 1547–1595* (Edinburgh, 1936), XI, 626.

⁹⁸ M. Baigent, “Painting,” 167.

⁹⁹ Sir Hugh Platt, *The Jewell House of Art and Nature* (London: Peter Short, 1594), 81–82.

¹⁰⁰ John Dee, *The Diaries of John Dee*, ed. Edward Fenton (Charlbury: Day Books, 1998), xii, 47, 337–38.

lamented that such charges were used to prevent advances in natural sciences, for Cardano, Baptista Porta, and "the rest of that magical crew" are used as bogeymen to instill "terror unto all new professors of rare and profitable inventions." Platt himself saw no contradiction in working on agricultural fertilizers and alchemical essences.

Platt also had contacts with working masons, whom he tried to win over to his project for mass-producing imitation stonecarvings moulded in plaster. When the London craftsmen proved to be "idle and ill disposed persons," he lamented that there were few capable workmen and artists in England—a complaint also made by Dee.¹⁰¹ That Platt was possibly initiated into a masonic guild is further suggested by his description of the secret method of communication by finger signs and positions of parts of the body that were considered a special masonic practice. Platt complained that his early publication of inventions and experiments met a hostile reception in England—a point that was probably communicated by Dickson to the Scottish court. Eventually, it would be the Stuart king, James VI and I, who knighted Platt for his contributions to natural science and the public welfare (in 1605).¹⁰²

When Schaw and the Setons returned to Scotland from France in late 1584, they undertook ambitious building projects at Seton Palace and other aristocratic residences. After the death of Lord George Seton in January 1585, his son Alexander carried on the construction efforts and advised other noblemen in their new projects. Alexander was praised by contemporaries as "a great humanist in prose and verse, Greek and Latin, and well versed in the mathematicks and had great skill in architecture."¹⁰³ He and his network of noble builders employed John Mylne, a talented craftsman from a traditional masonic family. Mylne allegedly became master mason to the king in 1584–85, and he would later initiate James into the mason's lodge at Scone.¹⁰⁴ Encouraged by the king and his closest courtiers, a widespread revival of building took place throughout the country.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰¹ H. Platt, *Jewel*, 41–68.

¹⁰² See "Sir Hugh Platt," DNB.

¹⁰³ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 29.

¹⁰⁴ H. Colvin, *Biog. Dict.*, 674–75.

¹⁰⁵ R. Mylne, *Master Masons*, 61.

During this period, the king followed his grandmother's strategy of employing his Master of Works in delicate diplomatic work, and he instructed Schaw to entertain the Danish ambassadors who had arrived in the hope of getting the Orkney and Shetland islands restored to Denmark. That the masonic St. Clair family had long historic ties to Orkney was perhaps relevant to the choice of Schaw. Moreover, Schaw would soon be engaged in the negotiations about a Danish marriage for James—again suggesting the king's confidence in his discretion and loyalty. While James continued his readings in the Hermetic and Cabalistic lore contained in his library, he may have discussed the esoteric traditions of the masons with Schaw. In 1586, hoping to gain even more insight into the poetry of architectural mysticism, James invited Du Bartas to Scotland and was delighted when the poet accepted the following year. Secretly instructed to propose a marriage for James with a princess of Navarre, Du Bartas arrived in May, only to learn that the Danish marriage had already been arranged. Nevertheless, he spent several months in intimate company with James and his circle, who included Schaw and Seton.

Given Du Bartas's interests in Hebraic and Cabalistic lore, he must have been pleased at James's translation from Tremellius, the converted Jewish scholar, and his reading of French translations of the Book of Maccabees, Philo, Josephus, and Leo Hebraeus.¹⁰⁶ In the latter's *Dialogue de l'amour* (1551), the king gained access to an eloquent, neo-Platonic version of Cabalistic sexual theosophy. Leo Hebraeus (Judah Abravanel) had contacts with the Jewish friends of Pico della Mirandola, whom he probably met, and he merged his own medical and scientific interests into his Cabalistic world-view.¹⁰⁷ Exiled from his home in Portugal, Abravanel expressed a theosophy of desire that reflected the Jews' yearning for return to Jerusalem and the Cabalists' yearning for cosmic reintegration. Because Abravanel's version of Jewish mysticism foreshadowed the Cabalistic teachings within later *Écossais* Masonic lodges, it will be useful to point out several of his "masonic" themes.

At the base is the Cabalistic view of the universe as a Grand Man or "Adam Kadmon." Thus, Abravanel affirmed that,

¹⁰⁶ G. Warner, *Library*, xxvi, l–liii.

¹⁰⁷ Léon Hébreu, *Dialogues d'amour*, ed. T.A. Perry (Chapel Hill: North Carolina UP, 1974), 9–21.

The entire universe is like an individual or person, and each of these corporeal and spiritual or eternal and corruptible parts is a member and part of this great individual, the whole and each of its parts having been produced by God for the common end of the whole, together with an end proper to each of its parts . . . The end of the whole is the unity [and] perfection of the entire universe, in accord with the design of the divine architect . . .¹⁰⁸

The relationship between all parts is sexual, with male and female polarities existing in all elements and spirits. Perry notes that in Abravanel,

. . . physical creation is a single living "animal" or organism made up of a union of upper and lower, active and passive, or Male and Female elements, just as "Adam" or man, generically speaking, denotes both sexes. In the first of an elaborate series of "correspondances" between the two . . . Leone states that the principal kind of love in both man and the physical universe is generative, and then he examines the physiolgical and cosmological causes of generation.¹⁰⁹

In his dialogues, Abravanel explained to "Sophie," the object of his ardent wooing, that this sexual cosmology was too "lascivious" to be presented openly to readers. Thus, since the days of the ancient Greeks, allegory had been used to disguise the erotic mysticism from the unworthy:

Leone holds that humanly invented or "artificial" fables . . . hold important truths, the true end of both kinds of stories being the preservation of doctrine. Thus, the ancients labored both in the "vraye cognoissance" of the sciences and also in the "artifice de la signification des choses des sciences."

Abravanel explained how this hieroglyphic language was used by the Pythagoreans and Cabalists, whose secrets can be penetrated by a "discipline divine" that involves techniques of meditation.¹¹⁰

One aspect of that discipline was the strengthening of memory. Abravanel suggested that memory involved the capacity for intense visualization of cosmological dynamics, as demonstrated in the correspondence between the eye and sun: "Just as the sun is an image

¹⁰⁸ T. Anthony Perry, *Erotic Spirituality: The Integrative Tradition from Leone Ebreo to John Donne* (Tuscaloosa: Alabama UP, 1980), 32.

¹⁰⁹ L. Hebréu, *Dialogues*, 18–19.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 19, 94, 213, 254.

of the divine intellect, the eye is the image of the human mind.”¹¹¹ Did the Scottish masons and architects at James VI’s court draw upon Abravanel to make the All-Seeing Eye an emblem of their secret tradition? In the eighteenth century, when *Écossais* Freemasons required a change of clothing into white vestments during initiation ceremonies, did they also draw on the *Dialogues de l’amour*? Abravanel explained that entrants to the Holy of Holies in the Temple had to change into white “vestemens mundes, purs et spirituels,” in order to fully contemplate God (an act described as an ecstatic sexual union).

Du Bartas utilized not only Abravanel but older Cabalistic works when he described the Holy of Holies and the Temple at Jerusalem. He also hinted at his familiarity with the ancient tradition of the sexually joined cherubim, which he attempted to Christianize. Like the Cabalists, Du Bartas equated the cosmos with the Temple and Torah, and he praised the work of the Divine Architect, who bodied forth this sexually-charged Creation:

Thou doost divide this *Sacred House* in Three;
Th’ *Holy of Holies*, where-in none may bee
But God, the Cherubims, and (once a yeer)
The *Sacred Figure* of Perfection deer,
Of Gods eternall Son (Sins sin-les check)
The ever-lasting true MELCHISEDEC:
The fair mid-TEMPLE, which is ope alone
To Sun-bright *Levites*, who *Izrael* shone . . .

.....
SANCTUM-SANCTORUM, is thy *Song of Songs*,
Where, in *Mysterious Verse* (as meet belongs)
Thou Mariest *Jacob* to Heav’ns glorious King
CHRIST’S and his CHURCHES *Epithalamie*.
Where (sweetly rapt in sacred Extasie)
The faith-ful Soule talks with her God immense,
Hears his sweet Voice, her self doth quintessence
In the pure flames of his sweet-pearing eyes
(The Cabinets where Grace and Glory lies)
Enjoies her Joy, in her chaste bed doth kisse
His holy lips (the Love of Loves) her Blisse.
When he had finisht and furnisht full
The *House of God*, so rich and bewtifull:
O God (sayd *Salomon*) great *Only-Trine*!
Which of this *Mystike* sacred House of thine

¹¹¹ Ibid., 21, 294.

Hath made mee Builder; Build Mee in the same
A living Stone.¹¹²

In James's later writings on magic and marriage, he hinted at his familiarity with these Cabalistic sexual and visionary traditions.¹¹³

For Du Bartas, the building of the Temple was a means of reconciling factions and bringing national unity—"Draw to thy TEMPLE, North, South, East, and West."¹¹⁴ Distressed by the religious wars in France, he suggested various foreign martial adventures in place of civil war—such as, "another crusade against the Turks in Anatolia." Thus, he was especially pleased with James's poem "Lepanto," in which the king described the victory of the Christian navy against the Turks in 1571. Du Bartas lavished praise on the poem and translated it into French. More than most readers, he would have approved of James's references to chivalric masons and knights. As the Christians "all prepar'd/To winne or els to die,"

The Mason clinckes on marble Stones,
Which hardlie drest he gets:
.....
Here Knights did dight their burnisht brands,
There Archers bowes did bend . . .¹¹⁵

Despite James's presentation of the battle as a great spiritual struggle against the anti-Christian infidels, he was attacked by Presbyterians for his positive portrayal of a Catholic hero, Don John of Austria, who led the Christian troops. Because of similar attacks by Protestant radicals in France, Du Bartas had earlier issued a call "upon all Christians to unite and oppose the infidel nations, once more with united front."¹¹⁶

Like Lull and earlier French and Scottish kings, Du Bartas lamented the degeneration of contemporary knights, whom he scorned as "perfumed stay-at-home soldiers" and "Carpet-Knights."¹¹⁷ Perhaps he discussed with James the need for Lullian illumination in order to revitalize the internationalist and spiritual goals of chivalry. That James owned and read many chivalric romances and epic histories

¹¹² Du Bartas, *Divine Weeks*, 695–96.

¹¹³ See ahead for discussion of *Daemonologie* (1597) and *Basilikon Doron* (1603).

¹¹⁴ Du Bartas, *Divine Weeks*, 697, 800–04, 819.

¹¹⁵ James VI, *Poems*, I, 224.

¹¹⁶ Du Bartas, *Works*, I, 132.

¹¹⁷ Du Bartas, *Divine Weeks*, 329–64, 330, 845.

of the crusades may have been relevant to his and Du Bartas's conceptions of spiritual knighthood and masonic restoration of the Temple. Moreover, the assimilation of Templar and Hospitaller traditions into the Protestant Sandilands family would make them more attractive to the Protestant king and Huguenot poet. At this time, James had access to the Sandilands' rare collection of Templar documents, through the marriage of Peter Young (his former tutor and present privy councillor) to the widow of James Sandilands.

When the English translator Sylvester later dedicated the most explicitly masonic section of *Divine Weeks* ("The Columns") to "Sir Peter Young of Seton Knight," he suggested Young's own interest in Du Bartas's masonic and chivalric themes.¹¹⁸ These chivalric initiatives shed some light on the later claim by the Seton family that they served as masonic protectors of the Order of the Temple, which was linked with the *Garde Écossais*. In 1587 there were four Setons and one St. Clair serving in the *Garde*, and in 1598 Sir John Cariston of Seton served as captain. By the 1630's, an important Scottish Freemason—Robert Moray—would also serve in the *Garde*.¹¹⁹ Thus, while James, Du Bartas, Young, and Alexander Seton shared their thoughts on the Temple and crusading knights, they may have rehabilitated the Templars in their own imaginations.

James owned the *Histoire de Godefroy de Bouillon* (1559), which presented a romantic view of the early Templars, while his French edition of Pedro Mexia's *Silva de varia lección* (1569) discounted the heresy charges against the later Templars and asserted that the populace viewed them as saints and martyrs, even preserving their clothes as relics.¹²⁰ In his volume of Fontanus's *Bellum Rhodium* (1524), the heirs of the Templars—the Knights Hospitaller—were presented so heroically that their dissolution by the Scottish Reformers and English queen must have seemed especially mean-spirited. Both James and Du Bartas read Jean Bodin, who not only praised the Templars but linked their persecution with that of the Jews and fraternities of artificers. Because Bodin's arguments provide an early example of merged Jewish-masonic history, his theories are relevant to the development of Stuart Freemasonry.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 902.

¹¹⁹ See ahead, Chapter 4.

¹²⁰ Pedro Mexia, *Silva de varia lección* (Valldolid, 1550–55), I, 5562–68; II, 478–81.

Bodin was so expert in the Hebrew language and theosophy that his contemporaries believed he was a crypto-Jew, whose family fled Spain after the expulsion order of 1492.¹²¹ Throughout his works, Bodin drew on Philo and the Cabalists to present an illuminist philosophy of the Master-builder who leads an ecumenical fraternity of enlightened brothers. In *The Six Books of a Commonwealth* (1576), Bodin presented an unusual view of the affair of the Templars:

... under the raigne of Philip the faire ... the Colledges in France before graunted until the Templers, at last by a decree of Pope Boniface the viii were taken from them, the master with a great number of his fellowes most cruelly burnt, and the order quite suppressed. All which for all that, the Germans by their writings have since showed to have beene but a malicious false accusation, invented for the taking away of their great landes and wealth from them. The like practise was also used against the Corporations and societies of the Jewes, as well in France ... as afterward in Spain ...

Wherefore, to decide the question before propounded, as whether Communities, Corporations, Societies, and Colledges be good in a Commonweale, or no? ... Truly in mine opinion nothing could ever have been devised more effectually or better for the keeping & maintaining of popular estates, or for the overthrow of tyrannicall governments, than corporations and societies ... The good king Numa was the first that ordained Societies and Fraternities of artificers and men of occupation ...¹²²

Du Bartas's own conception of gradual reformation under hereditary monarchy was heavily influenced by Bodin, and he in turn influenced James VI's conception of Scottish kingship. That Bodin saw a role for "fraternities of artificers" in the well-run kingdom may also have influenced the poet and king. Bodin's remarkable description would later seem prophetic, when he stressed that tyrants would always seek to overthrow these mystical fraternities, in which the "unitie and amitie of subjects" would lead to the "tyrants inevitable ruine and destruction." Scottish and Masonic supporters of the embattled Stuart monarchy in the next century would draw upon Bodin for their political manifestos against the "tyrant" Cromwell.¹²³

¹²¹ Jean Bodin, *Colloquium of the Seven about Secrets of the Sublime*, trans. Marion Kuntz (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1975), ix, xvi, xxvii, 36, 89, 94–95, 471.

¹²² Jean Bodin, *The Six Books of a Commonwealth*, ed. Kenneth McRae (1606; facs. rpt. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1962), 383.

¹²³ See David Stevenson, "The 'Letter on Sovereign Power' and the influence of Jean Bodin on Political Thought in Scotland," *SHR*, 61 (1982), 25–43.

Though Du Bartas greatly admired James, who begged him to stay in Scotland, he felt obligated to return to the service of Henri de Navarre. As the poet prepared to leave Scotland in August 1587, the king bestowed upon him a knighthood that perhaps reflected their mutual commitment to Lullist and Solomonic ideals. After his return to France, Du Bartas broadcast to the world his view of James as the embodiment of the great Jewish kings—"the *Scott'sh*, or rather th' *Hebrew David*"—whose religious poetry "shal sound/In high-built Temples" where the unilluminated will not be allowed to enter: "Gross Vulgar, hence; with hands profanely-vile,/So holy things presume not to defile."¹²⁴ As a "King (Heav'n-chosen, for some special Plot," James would hopefully imitate the Grand Architect who inspires the Christian poet and statesman:

For He (I hope) who no lesse good then wise,
First stirr'd us up to this great Enterprise,
And gave us hart to take the same in hand,
For Levell, Compasse, Rule, and Squire will stand;
Will change the Pebbles of our pudly thought,
To *Orient* Pearles, most bright and bravely wrought:
And will not suffer in this pretious *Frame*
Ought that a skilfull Builders eye may blame:

.....
JAMES, richest Jewel of *Scots*, and *Scotland's* Praise . . .
.....

O wise, worthy Prince,
May'st thou surmount all those in Excellence,
Which have (before thee) Rul'd th' hard-ruled *Scots* . . .¹²⁵

It is possible that James VI became a "Mason King" through the influence of Du Bartas and Schaw, and that his initiation provoked his subsequent preoccupation with the apocalyptic mysticism of the Jerusalem Temple. In 1588 James wrote *An Fruitfull Meditatioun* on sections of the Book of Revelation of St. John, in which he discussed the process of measuring the Temple and then contrasted the inward Temple (*Sanctum Sanctorum*) of the true Church with the outward Temple of the hypocritical, anti-Christian Church.¹²⁶ Faced with constant threats from rebellious kirkmen and nobles, James must have

¹²⁴ Du Bartas, *Divine Weeks*, 493, 653.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 490–91.

¹²⁶ James VI and I, *The Workes of James, King of Great Britaine, France, and Ireland* (London: Robert Barker and John Bell, 1616), 32.

taken comfort in a preceding passage in Revelations: "Hold that fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown. Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the temple of my God" (III, 11-12).

Early in 1589 James wrote *Ane Meditation Upon the First Buke of the Chronicles of the Kings* (XV, 25-29), which recounted the joyous processional when David brought the ark of the covenant to the tent he had pitched for it. Readers who utilized the king's commentary would immediately notice that in the preceding chapter, David's retrieval of the ark was made possible because of a masonic action:

Now Hiram king of Tyre sent messengers to David, and timber of cedars, with masons and carpenters, to build him an house.

And David perceived that the Lord had confirmed him king over Israel, for his kingdom was lifted up on high . . .

(I Chronicles XIV, 1-2)

James stressed that Moses received the design of the ark of the tabernacle directly from God. His remarks thus provided masonic background for the succeeding chapters.

After the processional, David worried that while he dwelled in the fine house built by Hiram, "the ark of the covenant of the Lord remaineth under curtains" (XVII, 1). Determined to provide a more magnificent setting, he "set masons to work to hew wrought stones to build the house of God" (XXII, 2). However, God refused to allow David to build the Temple because he had "been a man of war, and hast shed blood." Thus, he must name his son Solomon as king and pass on to him the design of the Temple which "he had by the spirit": "All this, said David, the Lord made me understand in writing by his hand upon me, even all the works of this pattern" (XXVII, 3, 12, 19). David then called upon "the artificers" and asked, "who then is willing to consecrate his service this day unto the Lord?" He urged them to serve his son, the peace-making Solomon (XXIX, 5). James probably learned from Schaw and his craftsmen that the core of masonic tradition was contained in II Chronicles, when Solomon called upon Hiram of Tyre to direct the masons and carvers of the Temple. Did James now see himself as the Solomonic heir of his architecturally-gifted but war-making ancestors?

Though John Mylne's initiation of James into the lodge at Scone allegedly took place in 1601, it is possible that the king first became associated with the fraternity in the late 1580's. As royal master mason, Mylne was made a burgess at Dundee in September 1586, just after Du Bartas left Scotland, and he gained more contracts and

honors over the next years. The possibility that James was an initiate is reinforced by his subsequent utilization of “the craftsmen” to help him out of a political difficulty. As noted earlier, James had employed Schaw, his Master of Works, in negotiations with the Danish ministers, who now were working out plans for his marriage to Princess Anne of Denmark. However, Queen Elizabeth suddenly opposed the wedding and proposed instead negotiations with the court of Navarre. According to the loyal courtier Sir James Melville,

Upon this answer of England, our Council was convened, and enticed to vote against the marriage of Denmark. Whereat his Majesty took such a despite, that he caused one of his most familiar servants to deal secretly with some of the deacons of the craftsmen of Edinburgh, to make a mutiny against the Chancellor and Council, threatening to slay him in case the marriage with the King of Denmark’s daughter were hindered, or longer delayed.¹²⁷

The “familiar servant” was probably Schaw, who was suffering harassment from the same radical Protestants who opposed the king. In 1588 Schaw’s name appeared on a list of Papists whom the Presbytery of Edinburgh was empowered to examine if they dared “resort to court.”¹²⁸

If James was now a “Mason King,” he may have counted upon Schaw and his fellow craftsmen to help him in secret and difficult matters. The current employment of many masons by the Catholic Seton and St. Clair families, who were determined to repair the architectural damage inflicted by English troops and their radical Presbyterian supporters, perhaps influenced the willingness of masons to serve the Catholic Master of Works and his tolerant king in an anti-English plot. Moreover, the masons’ access to the Hermetic and Cabalistic sciences (accepted by Du Bartas and James as permissible “good” magic) would provide the king with a weapon in the bizarre case of the Danish witches, whose magically-produced storms prevented his bride from sailing to Scotland. Thus, when James took Schaw along on his impulsive and romantic voyage to Denmark to collect Princess Anne, there was possibly a magical, masonic element involved in the mission. The odd cult of Du Bartas that developed

¹²⁷ James Melville, *Memoirs of Sir James Melville*, ed. A. Francis Stewart (London: Routledge, 1929), 326.

¹²⁸ “William Schaw,” DNB.

in Denmark, leading to the false claim that the poet visited there, was perhaps linked to the Du Bartasan enthusiasm of the Scottish king and courtiers who did arrive in 1589.

Unable to return because of the frozen sea, James profited intellectually from his residency by conversing with the Danish theologian Niels Hemmingsen, an erudite Hebraist, whose treatise on witchcraft, *Admonitio de Superstitionibus Magicis Vitandis* (1575), became a major source for James's later writings on the subject. He also visited Hemmingsen's former student Tycho Brahe at Uraniborg, the astronomer's fantastic castle-cum-laboratory on the island of Hven. James and Schaw became privy to Tycho's mystical vision of architecture, which he developed after studying Vitruvius, observing Palladio's villas in Italy, and recruiting designers and masons for the late Danish king, Frederick II (d. 1588).¹²⁹ Frederick had been an ambitious builder, and his first architect was a stonemason who had worked for Palladio. His protégé Tycho shared the royal interest in all aspects of design and construction. When Tycho planned his Temple of Urania, he invited foreign master-builders to advise him, while he used "his own compass and ruler" to design the castle and employed "excellent stonemasons" to "carry out the rich carving" of allegorical figures.¹³⁰ James was so impressed with the work of Tycho's artisans that he distributed largesse to "the masons, wrights, and workmen" he observed during their labors.¹³¹

Determined to make Uraniborg "a magical talisman of the universe," Tycho established an elaborate geometrical plan, requiring a skilled artist to carry out his theoretical program, which was at "the cutting edge of mannerist architecture."¹³² Aristocratic friends and operative masons participated in the dedication of the cornerstone of Uraniborg, which was embellished with "emblems mystical and sacred" in the service of *amicitia*, or sacred friendship. Like Frederick II and James VI, Tycho was interested in the Art of Memory and Bruno's works. Though famous for his mathematical and astronomical expertise, he told James of his disbelief in Copernican theories,

¹²⁹ Victor Thoren, *The Lord of Uraniborg: A Biography of Tycho Brahe* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1900), 106–13; John Robert Christianson, *On Tycho's Island: Tycho Brahe and His Assistants* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000), 7, 20, 51, 61–62.

¹³⁰ John A. Gade, *The Life and Times of Tycho Brahe* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1947), 55, 62–68.

¹³¹ D. Stevenson, *Scotland's Last Royal Wedding*, 50–51.

¹³² J. Christianson, *Tycho's Island*, 53, 61–64.

which were at odds with his Hermetic world-view. The Scots learned that his research institute included an alchemical lab as well as contraptions for secret “magical” communications.¹³³

That Tycho also kept “an idiot . . . gifted with second sight” as his companion at meals must have piqued James’s curiosity about this peculiarly Scottish-Scandinavian gift of precognition.¹³⁴ James probably shared a story currently circulating in Scotland about the second-sight prediction of his mother’s execution. As the king recounted, “her deathe was visible in Scotlande before it did really happen, being . . . spoken of in secrete by those whose power of sighte presentede to them a bloodie heade dancinge in the aire.”¹³⁵ For Danish astronomer and Scottish king, there was no discrepancy in studying ancient traditions of magic and contemporary innovations in science. James would later write Tycho to thank him for revealing “things which still delighted his mind.”¹³⁶ After James left Uraniborg, several of his courtiers returned for further inspections.

The Scottish party studied other royal construction projects, which greatly impressed James. Under an aristocratic regency, the eleven year-old king Christian IV was receiving an excellent education, in which his penchant for mathematics, mechanics, and architecture was encouraged. He would later design and supervise the construction of magnificent royal castles, which embodied Tycho’s “arcane theories of nature” and expressed Christian’s esoteric “court culture.”¹³⁷ James’s visit with his new brother-in-law and Tycho Brahe inaugurated a closeness in Scottish-Danish architectural relations which lasted for several decades.¹³⁸ James sent Schaw back to Scotland to prepare Holyrood Palace for the wedding celebration and to carry out improvements on Dunfermline Abbey, part of Queen Anne’s jointure settlement. Schaw may also have carried instructions to reorganize the masonic fraternity, to improve the education of craftsmen, and to infuse higher spiritual ambitions into architectural projects.

¹³³ K. Léon-Jones, *Bruno and Kabbalah*, 14.

¹³⁴ Mark Napier, *Memoirs of John Napier of Merchiston* (Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1834), 359–60.

¹³⁵ John Harington to Sir Amias Paulet (December 1603?); in *The Letters and Epigrams of Sir James Harington*, ed. N.E. McClure (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania UP, 1930), 111.

¹³⁶ J.L.E. Dreyer, *Tycho Brahe* (Edinburgh: A. and C. Black, 1890), 204.

¹³⁷ J. Christianson, *Tycho’s Island*, 243. Though Christian IV drove Tycho out of Denmark in 1596, he retained his interest in Tychonian architectural philosophy.

¹³⁸ M. Glendinning, *History*, 38.

Clulee points out that Tycho Brahe's research institute, with its exoteric and esoteric features, was strikingly similar to that proposed by John Dee to Queen Elizabeth.¹³⁹ Tycho admired the scientific and magical works of "the most noble and illustrious John Dee," and he was currently corresponding with him.¹⁴⁰ Tycho, James, and Schaw may have discussed Dee's proposals for improving the mathematical capacity of artisans, craftsmen, mechanics, and non-academic gentlemen, for the volume of Euclid in the king's library was probably Henry Billingsley's English translation with Dee's famous "Mathematicall Preface" (1570). In arguments that would have appealed to architecturally-gifted Scottish patriots, Dee lambasted the low status of architecture in England:

Architecture, to many may seme not worthy, to be reck'nd among the *Artes Mathematicall*. To whom, I thinke good, to give some account of my so doing. Not worthy (will they say), by cause it is but for building of a house, Pallace, Church, Forte, or such like, grosse workes. And you, also, defined the *Artes Mathematicall*, to be such as dealt with no Material or corruptible thing . . . But, you see, that I count here *Architecture* among those *Artes Mathematicall*, which are derived from Principals: and you know that such may deale with Naturall thinges and Sensible matter. Of which, some draw nerer to the Simple and absolute Mathematicall Speculation than others do. And though the *Architect* procureth, enformeth, & directeth the *Mechanicien*, to handworke & the building actuall, of house, Castell, or Pallace, and is chief judge of the same; yet, with him Selfe (as chief, *Master*, and *Architect*), remaineth the Demonstrative reason and cause of the Mechaniciens worke in Lyne, plaine, and Solid: by *Geometricall*, *Arithmetical*, *Opticall*, *Musical*, *Astronomicall*, *Cosmographicall* . . . able to be confirmed and established.¹⁴¹

Because of this devaluation of architecture, few in England "in our dayes" attain to the mathematical mastery necessary to great building. Even worse is the "scarcitie of Artificers" and skilled craftsmen. Dee boldly identified Christ as "our Heavenly Archemaster," and he urged English artisans to study Vitruvius and Alberti to improve their skills.

¹³⁹ Nicholas Clulee, *John Dee's Natural Philosophy: Between Science and Religion* (London: Routledge, 1988), 190–91.

¹⁴⁰ Peter French, *John Dee: The World of an Elizabethan Magus* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972), 5.

¹⁴¹ Dee's preface to *The Elements of Geometrie of the Most Auncient Philosopher EUCLIDE of Megara*, trans. Henry Billingsley (London: John Daye, 1570).

Dee also linked mathematics and architecture to the occult sciences, which he traced from their Egyptian and Mosaic sources. He argued that number equals “the patterne in the mind of the creator” and functions as “a third being” between “things natural and supernatural.” He stressed the importance of Nicholas of Cusa (a Lullist), Roger Bacon, Agrippa, Trithemius, Pico, and Cardano in revealing this magical nexus to the illuminated. And, like the Scottish king and his architects, Dee believed in the importance of the Art of Memory. However, Dee’s enthusiasms for “inventions of strange and wonderful things” and his mystical sense of “Archemastrie” provoked charges of black magic against him. In a “Digression Apologeticall” to his preface, Dee felt compelled to defend himself against charges that he was a “Caller, and Conjurer of wicked and damned Spirits.” In 1570 the English queen did not accept Dee’s petition for a mathematical society, but two decades later the Scottish king may have been more sympathetic to a Dee-Brahe type of institution.

Shortly after James VI’s return from Denmark in May 1590, he received a proposal from John Napier of Merchiston, a brilliant mathematician and mechanician, that he patronize a revival of science and invention in Scotland. As an avid collector of mathematical works, Napier was familiar with Dee’s *Mathematicall Preface*. His first cousin, Dr. Richard Napier of Buckinghamshire, would later protect Dee and acquire many of his manuscripts.¹⁴² In fact, the Napier family became the major transmitters of the Dee tradition in the next century. In his letter to James, John Napier stressed,

. . . that here are within your realm (as well as in other countries) godly and good ingynes [minds], versed and exercized in all manner of honest science and godly discipline, who, by your Majesties instigation, might yield forth works and fruits worthy of memory, which otherwise (lacking some mighty Maecenas to incourage them) may perhaps be buried in eternal silence.¹⁴³

Napier was also a good friend of the king’s physician Dr. John Craig, who had visited Uraniborg and now carried on a mathematical debate with Tycho. Craig undoubtedly informed Napier about the nature of Tycho’s projects, and it is possible that Napier saw the

¹⁴² P. French, *Dee*, 11.

¹⁴³ M. Napier, *Life*, 359.

Scottish organization of masonry as a vehicle for similar exoteric-esoteric, mathematical-mechanical reform.¹⁴⁴

According to Cooper, Napier was associated with the masonic craft.¹⁴⁵ He had earlier supervised the construction of his own castle at Gartnes, where he worked closely with the masons, and the mathematical-geometrical demands of architecture stimulated his early investigations into the secrets of numbers. While seeking answers to questions like this—"if 4 builders construct a wall 6 feet high and 48 ells long in 42 days, it is demanded, in how many days will 5 builders erect a wall 9 feet high, and 50 ells long?"—Napier eventually invented logarithms.¹⁴⁶ He was fascinated by the design and construction of sundials, which were "virtually stone exercises in solid geometry." Stevenson points out that dialling was one of the skills of the architect as defined by Vitruvius and that sundials became one of the most distinctive products of Scottish masons.¹⁴⁷

Napier also carried out the duties of a quartermaster-general in land surveying, and he invented many mechanical devices for military use—projects which came under the provenance of masonry in Scotland. He would later praise the "workes of expert craftsmen," while his portrait shows him holding a masonic-mathematical compass.¹⁴⁸ That Napier also practised alchemy, experimented with magic squares, and read widely in Jewish mystical lore was consistent with the esoteric aims of Dee and Tycho and the Cabalistic traditions of the masons. He would later urge James to play the role of King David, and he speculated on the destruction and restoration of the Temple.¹⁴⁹

Given this context, the masonic initiatives of William Schaw in 1590 were perhaps influenced by Napier's proposals as well as the

¹⁴⁴ On the role of Napier and his circle of Edinburgh mathematicians in making "freemasonry socially possible," see Arthur Williamson, "Number and National Consciousness: the Edinburgh Mathematicians and Scottish Political Culture at the Union of the Crowns," in Roger Mason, ed., *Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994), 192.

¹⁴⁵ Personal communication from Robert Cooper, Librarian of Grand Lodge of Scotland.

¹⁴⁶ M. Napier, *Memoirs*, 493.

¹⁴⁷ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 113–14.

¹⁴⁸ M. Napier, *Memoirs*, 247–48; John Read, "Scottish Alchemy in the Seventeenth Century," *Chymia*, 1 (1948), 145.

¹⁴⁹ John Napier, *A Plaine Discovery of the Whole Revelation of St. John*, 5th ed. (Edinburgh: Andrew Wilson, 1645); the first edition of 1593 was dedicated to James VI.

king's directives. While reconstructing the palace and Gothic abbey at Dunfermline for James's bride, Schaw soon became a great favorite of Queen Anne, who reinforced her husband's determination to carry out impressive architectural projects. In September James officially recognized the qualifications of Patrick Copland of Udoch, who served the Catholic earls of Huntly, to act as warden over the masons in the Aberdeen region.¹⁵⁰ In the document, James referred to the ancient traditions of the craft and to the method of election of the chief warden by master masons. The king and his Master of Works were perhaps moved by the recent death of Du Bartas to regenerate the "sons of Solomon," who had figured so prominently in Du Bartas's poetry.

At this period, while Presbyterians worried about a revival of Catholic influence on the court, Alexander Dickson sensed an opportunity to exploit his mastery of the Art of Memory among the masonic-Catholic courtiers. When he appeared at the court in 1591, he acted as an agent of the Catholic earls and planned to proceed to Flanders on a secret mission.¹⁵¹ Dickson, whose attendance was permitted by the king, arrived just when James was desperately trying to capture the renegade Earl of Bothwell, recently implicated in the trial of the Scottish witches who allegedly plotted James's death. When charges against the witches first surfaced, James was initially sceptical but, when he examined one of them, he was shocked to hear her quote the intimate conversation between himself and Queen Anne on the night of their honeymoon.¹⁵² By 1591 the witches had implicated Bothwell in their plot, charging that he hoped to gain the throne through his diabolic arts.

With painful memories of his mother's deposition in an atmosphere of magic and treachery and of her execution by Queen Elizabeth four years earlier, James took seriously the revelations at the witchcraft trials. Reinforced by his experiences in Denmark, where the Danish witches were also arrested, and his readings in Hemmingsen, James became convinced of the threat of black magic to his reign and Scotland's welfare. It is possible that he saw in masonry a means of strengthening white magic—the Cabalistic-Hermetic arts of Solomon—as a healthy alternative. In 1638, when Scottish masons

¹⁵⁰ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 32–33.

¹⁵¹ *CSP, Scotland, 1547–95*, XI, 626.

¹⁵² E. Cowan, "Darker Vision," 125–40.

boasted of possessing the gift or art of second sight, they probably drew on earlier traditions. Thus, James's research into the phenomenon may have been connected with his interest in masonry. Provoked by the second-sight of his mother's execution and perhaps by conversations with Tycho Brahe, James read widely on clairvoyance and prophecy. In a later conversation, he "did remarke muche on this gifte, and saide he had soughte out of certaine bookes a Sure waie to attaine knowledge of future chanches."¹⁵³

In 1592, while the kirk underwent "one of its more strongly protestant and presbyterian phases," some masons at Burntisland tried to design a church that would express the simplified needs of a sermon- and elder-oriented congregation.¹⁵⁴ This effort possibly contributed to a statement recorded in 1652 that craftsmen and clergymen possessed the "Mason Word" in "the purest tymes of this kirke"—i.e., during the Burntisland period.¹⁵⁵ Perhaps provoked by this Presbyterian masonic initiative, in 1592 James increased his royal authority over and expanded the organization of masonry in Dundee by including all craftsmen "that wirkis be quare reule; lyne; or compass under the airts of geometrie."¹⁵⁶ This possibly included smiths and metal-workers, as would be claimed in later St. Clair masonic charters.

At this time, James's Master of the Mint was Alexander Napier who, with his son John, carried out metallurgical and alchemical experiments which now fell under the masons' purview of geometry. In the same year, John Napier was writing a *Plaine Discovery of the Whole Revelation of St. John*, which he published in 1593 and dedicated to the king. Napier proudly affirmed that he utilized the Bible "printed at Antwerp by Plantin," and its emblematic compass possibly carried masonic significance for the Scot. In his apocalyptic treatise, Napier revealed his immersion in Jewish Temple mysticism and Cabalistic angel lore, subjects of great interest to later Freemasons.

In 1592 James also suggested his continuing interest in the Art of Memory, when he intervened to save its propagandist Dickson from imprisonment by the Presbyterians. The kirkmen had been infuriated by Dickson's stubborn defense of Catholicism and, despite the

¹⁵³ J. Harington, *Letters*, 111.

¹⁵⁴ D. Howard, *Scottish Architecture*, 334.

¹⁵⁵ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 128.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 59.

king's action, they forced the Earl of Errol to dismiss Dickson from employment. In 1593 the impecunious Dickson offered to win the Catholic earls over to Elizabeth or to act as a spy for England. Perhaps he followed the advice of Cardano and employed the mnemonic art in his secret espionage work, while he maintained his contacts with the Catholic and masonic circles of Schaw, Seton, Huntley, and other builders. In the meantime, John Napier attempted to "help the weakness of memory" which contributed to difficulty in "mathematicall calculations," while he worked on his theory of logarithms—a theory developed with the needs of builders in mind.¹⁵⁷

With the intensifying interest in the Lullist Art of Memory among James's courtiers, it is relevant that a rare example of Lullist-Spanish architecture was currently underway at Barnes, under the direction of Sir John Seton, a cosmopolitan Catholic kinsman of Alexander Seton.¹⁵⁸ Having served as Master of the Household at the court of Phillip II in Spain, Sir John brought back to Scotland an enthusiasm for Spanish architectural design and technique. While he labored to build a Scottish version of the Alcazar palace at Toledo, he may also have illuminated his team of masons with Lullist expertise. However, after his death in 1594, the castle remained unfinished, despite the outburst of architectural and masonic activity which occurred during that year.

James's architectural ambitions were further stimulated by the birth of Prince Henry Stuart in 1594, and a delighted king planned a sumptuous international celebration for Henry's baptism. In August James ordered the rebuilding of the Chapel Royal at Stirling, and he worked with Schaw on the ambitious design. The doorway was a triumphal arch with a superstructure, which was "Scotland's first known building based upon formal 'correct' use of classical Orders." And, as MacKechnie further argues, the rest of the design proclaimed James as Solomon:

As described in I Kings 6, Solomon's Temple had three components: the porch (*'ulam*) at one end, the Great Chamber (*hekhal* or *cella*) and, beyond, the Holy of Holies (*devir*), producing a total length: breadth ration of 3.5:1. The height of the *cella* was 1.5 times the width, providing (although the Temple's end components were taller) an overall

¹⁵⁷ M. Napier, *Memoirs*, 381.

¹⁵⁸ D. Howard, *Scottish Architecture*, 60; M. Glendinning, *History*, 51.

proportion off 1:3.5:1.5; as used also on Constantine's Old St. Peter's, Rome. These are also the proportions of the Chapel Royal.¹⁵⁹

The poet Fowler described the king's enthusiastic collaboration with Schaw's building project: "he had the supply of the greatest number of Artificers in the whol cuntrie, convened there, of all craftes for that service, and his Majesties owne person daily overseer, with large and liberal payment."¹⁶⁰ However, there were not enough funds to complete the chapel, and an English agent reported scornfully:

The misery of this country still increases by the poverty of the prince and quarrels among the subjects. The "moyens are so meane" to bear out this baptism, that his majesty shall have great shame before the end . . . the great Temple of Solomon which is abuilding cannot be completed before the day prefixt.¹⁶¹

Nevertheless, according to MacKechnie, "Schaw's sophisticated design made the chapel a paradigmatic work of the Scottish Renaissance, important both for James's kingship and the history of freemasonry."¹⁶²

The building of the Temple was linked with praise for a contemporary crusading order, as revealed by Fowler's script for the royal masque. The king, Earl of Mar, and Thomas Erskine played Knights of Malta who take the field against the infidel Turks. During the ceremonies, sixteen barons and gentlemen were made knights, receiving instructions in chivalric duties and giving oaths to defend the king and the true Christian religion. Though James greatly admired the Knights of Malta, their continuing role as a Catholic order meant that the masque "was greatly disliked by some ministers of the kirk."¹⁶³ The iconoclasts were further disturbed by suspiciously "Papist" emblems, such as the symbolic device on the king's arms, described by Fowler as a "Lyons heade with open eye which signifieth a mistique and Hieroglyphique sence, Fortitude and Vigilance."¹⁶⁴ At the banquet, there was a pastry Tabernacle, representing fecundity.

Though James and Schaw tried to implement policies of religious conciliation and masonic revival, sectarian hostilities continued to

¹⁵⁹ A. MacKechnie, "James VI's Architects," 163.

¹⁶⁰ W. Fowler, *Works*, II, 171.

¹⁶¹ W. Boyd and H. Meikle, *Calendar . . . Scotland*, X, 377.

¹⁶² A. MacKechnie, "James VI's Architects," 165.

¹⁶³ M. Lynch, "Court Ceremony," 89.

¹⁶⁴ W. Fowler, *Works*, II, 184, 189.

polarize Protestant and Catholic builders. In 1595 at Prestonpans, the radical Calvinist John Davidson determined to build a T-shaped church, whose simple classicism represented a break with medieval masonic tradition and a move towards modern vernacular, Presbyterian architecture.¹⁶⁵ James, who despised Davidson and had earlier exiled him to England, must have enjoyed the resistance to the architectural project mustered by Alexander Seton and Mark Kerr, who maintained their devotion to Franco-Italian ("Papist") design and ornamentation. That Kerr was also a close friend of the Protestant John Napier, who shared his interest in magical studies, did not deter Davidson from predicting that Kerr would soon die by the hand of God's wrath because of his opposition to the anti-Papist church construction.¹⁶⁶

In this atmosphere of architectural enthusiasm and controversy, the Master of Memory—Alexander Dickson—temporarily lost his entrée to the court. By May 1595, though Dickson had been dealing with the king himself, James suspected that he was a double agent who had shifted his allegiance from the Catholic earls to the English ministers. In June an English spy reported that Dickson had taken leave of the king, "to whom he 'made motion' of his service done to the King's mother and requiring his consideration thereof," but James replied, "The devil a penny. Let him gange to Bowes [Elizabeth's ambassador] and the mynisters."¹⁶⁷ Dickson then resolved to sell his "casket," which supposedly contained the military spy reports he made for the French, back to the English ministers. Though Dickson's shifting loyalties made him obnoxious to the king, he maintained secret contacts with James's Catholic courtiers.

After Dickson left Scotland for the Continent, his assistant Dr. Peter Lowe moved to Glasgow and tried to gain James's favor by dedicating to him an occultist medical treatise, *The Whole Course of Chirurgie* (1597). The cautious Lowe omitted any reference to Dickson, but he made clear his own indebtedness to the Lullist and Cardanist Art of Memory in the development of his Hermetic-Paracelsan expertise in medicine. Lowe asserted that he would not conceal his art in "letters Hydrographicks" like the Egyptians, but would make it

¹⁶⁵ D. Howard, *Scottish Architecture*, 183–86.

¹⁶⁶ On Ker and Napier, see A. Williamson, "Number and National Consciousness," 198.

¹⁶⁷ *CSP. Scotland, 1547–95*, X, 598, 609.

useful for the kingdom. Lowe's overture was successful, and the one-time servant of the Memory Master was subsequently granted royal letters to found the Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons in Glasgow.

It is possible that James was partly inspired to write his own treatise on the occult sciences, the *Daemonologie* (1597), to counter the influence of disloyal "magical" intriguers like Dickson and Bothwell, who undermined his policy of religious conciliation. Ostensibly, James was determined to refute the scepticism expressed by an English author, Reginald Scot, whose *Discoverie of Witchcraft* (1584) exposed the acts of magicians as wilful impostures or the results of mental disturbance in the observer.¹⁶⁸ Scot's major targets were Bodin and Hemmingsen, two authors admired by James. In mocking Bodin's account of a Knight Hospitaller at Rhodes and claiming that the knight used deceptive tricks, Scot belittled the crusaders whom James praised in *Lepanto* and the Knights of Malta masque.¹⁶⁹ Though Scot gave informative details on the Jewish Cabala, he dismissed it as superstition because Christ would not have hidden such a powerful art from his church. Then, he made an interesting analogy between the Cabala and the classical mnemonic art:

Here is place also for the Cabalisticall art, consisting of unwritten verities, which the Jewes doo beleeeve and brag that God himselfe gave to *Moses* in the mount *Sinai*; and afterwards was taught onelie with livelie voice, by degrees of succession, without writing, until the time of *Esdras*: even as the scholars of *Archippus* did use wit and memorie in steed of books.¹⁷⁰

Scot attacked many of James's favorite authors and themes and, even worse, his ridicule of the recent witch trials in England undermined the validity of the Scottish trials. Like Scot, who often quoted Cardano, Agrippa, and Bruno (when they were critical of outright trickery), James used his extensive reading in magical texts to counter the sceptic's argument. Curiously, he also employed the language of masonry when he described the "craft of magic."¹⁷¹ He referred to "the first entresses and prenticeshippe of them that gives themselves to that craft," and "their initiating in that ordour," where "they be

¹⁶⁸ James VI, *Minor Prose*, 110.

¹⁶⁹ Reginald Scot, *The Discoverie of Witchcraft*, introd. Montagu Summers (London: John Rodker, 1930), 53–55.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 113.

¹⁷¹ James VI, *Minor Prose*, 11, 13, 23–24.

passed Prentices” and then become “deacons in this craft.” The editor Craigie points out that James’s use of the latter phrase is unusual, possibly unique, in the 1590’s:

James . . . seems to be using it here in the narrower sense of ‘a master craftsmen,’ i.e., one who has served an apprenticeship in the craft and has been passed master in it by his craft guild, a sense not recorded in the OED till 1814, when Sir Walter Scott used it in *Waverley*, ch. xlv, Yon man is not a deacon o’ his craft.¹⁷²

That Walter Scott was a Freemason and deeply versed in Jacobean and Jacobite history means he undoubtedly recognized the masonic connotations of James’s usage.

Like the masons, who worried about *cowans* (uninitiated artisans) gaining access to their secrets, James was careful not to reveal too much of his magical knowledge:

I therefore have framed my whole discours, only to prove that such things are and may be, by such number of examples as I show to be possible by reason: & keepes me from dipping any further in playing the part of a Dictionarie, to tell what ever I have read or harde in that purpose, which both would exceed fayth, and rather would seeme to teach such unlawfull artes, nor to disallow and condemne them . . .¹⁷³

Later observers of James would comment that he “was ever apt to search into secrets,” while he observed and controlled events from a concealed position.¹⁷⁴ It is possible that he was already using masonry as a clandestine system of support for his policies.

In October 1596 the radical Presbyterian Andrew Melville insulted and frightened the king by grabbing his sleeve and calling him “God’s silly vassal.”¹⁷⁵ Melville especially resented James’s willingness to employ men of differing religious beliefs, as long as they publicly conformed, and he called the king’s policy “devilish and pernicious” for seeking service from “Jew and Gentile, Protestant and Papist.” When other kirkmen further attacked the royal authority and tried to get rid of Alexander Seton and the Octavians (James’ financial commissioners), the king called upon the craftsmen of Edinburgh to suppress the rebellious mob. That the provost of the city was able to organize the craftsmen in support of the crown may have influenced

¹⁷² Ibid., 118.

¹⁷³ Ibid., 53.

¹⁷⁴ Alvin Kernan, *Shakespeare, the King’s Playwright* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1995), 54.

¹⁷⁵ M. Lee, *Great Britain’s Solomon*, 79.

James's subsequent determination to appoint Seton as provost, in the face of Presbyterian criticism of the latter's Papist tendencies. As a respected patron of the masons, Seton had important influence on networks of craftsmen throughout the country. From this time forward, he also worked closely with Schaw, who helped him remodel Fyvie Castle and construct a monumental triumphal arch, which both required sophisticated masonic skills.¹⁷⁶

James was so provoked by Melville's claim that the kirk possessed a higher law than the king's that he published *The True Lawe of free Monarchies* (1598), in which he further utilized the terminology of craft fraternities. Drawing heavily on Old Testament descriptions of Jewish kings anointed by God, James called for obedience and reverence to the hereditary king as father and head of his nation:

... if the children may upon any pretext . . . lawfully rise up against their father, cut him off, and choose any other whom they please in his rowme; & and if the body, for the weale of it, may for any infirmities that can be in the head strike it off; then I can not denie that the people may rebell, control, & displace, or cut off their King at their owne pleasure . . . And whether these similitudes represent better the office of a King; or the offices of Maisters or Deacons of craftes, or Doctors in Phisike (which jolly comparisons are used by such writers as mayntaine the contrarie proposition) I leave it to readers discretion.¹⁷⁷

Craigie notes that James here uses the term "deacons of craftes" in its more exoteric sense of the principal officers in incorporated crafts or trades in Scottish towns.¹⁷⁸

It is possible that the Melvilles, who had protected certain Protestant masons, advocated election of the king in the same way that craftsmen elected their deacons and wardens. That James did not condemn that practice within the crafts is significant, but he insisted that the crafts then owed their allegiance to their sovereign king. This dual structure—democratic within the lodge but royalist within the nation—would be revealed in a Masonic document of 1659, when it clearly served the Stuart restoration effort.¹⁷⁹ To conclude

¹⁷⁶ For the probable collaboration of Seton and Schaw, see D. Howard, *Scottish Architecture*, 64.

¹⁷⁷ James VI, *Minor Prose*, 75.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 140.

¹⁷⁹ Royal Society, London. MS Register Book (C), IX, ff. 240–52: Thomas Martin, "Narrative of the Free Masons Word and Signs" (1659). For further discussion of this MS., see ahead Chapter 6.

his treatise on free monarchies, James called for civil and religious peace and, harking back to the masonic vision of “the Divine Poet DU BARTAS,” he quoted: “Better it were to suffer some disorder in the estate, and some spots in the common-wealth, then, in pretending to reforme utterlie to over-throwe the Republicke.”¹⁸⁰

In a treatise on kingship, *Basilikon Doron*, which James drafted in October 1598, he advised his young son to train himself for the “craft” of ruling:

But above all vertues, study to knowe well your owne craft, which is to rule your people. And when I say this I bid you knowe all craftes. For except ye knowe everie one, howe can ye controlle every one, whiche is your proper office? . . . study not for knowledge nakedly; but that your principall end be, to make you able thereby to use your office . . . all artes and sciences are linked everie-one with other, their greatest principles agreeing . . .¹⁸¹

The latter statement clearly echoes the Lullist principles of the Art of Memory, which would soon be required in the training of masons.

James’s further advice to Prince Henry had a definite masonic resonance. After noting that “I would have you a Pythagorist” in political theory, James counselled:

As for the studie of other liberall artes and sciences, I would have you reasonable versed in them, but not preassing to be a passe-maister in any of them: for that cannot but distract you from the points of yhour calling . . . and when, by the enemy winning the towne, ye shall be interrupted in your demonstration, as Archimedes was; . . . I graunt it is meete ye have some entrance, speciallie in the Mathematickes; for the knowledge of the arte militarie, in situation of Campes, ordering of battels, making Fortifications, placing of batteries, or suche like.¹⁸²

These martial skills were considered the provenance of masonry, and the young prince would soon study with and work under the king’s quartermaster-general, master gunner, and other experts in military masonry.

At this time, John Napier also hoped to utilize the “worke of expert craftsmen” to construct his “Secrett Inventionis” of military artifacts.¹⁸³ Two years earlier (1596), when Napier feared a Spanish

¹⁸⁰ James VI, *Minor Prose*, 77.

¹⁸¹ James VI, *The Basilikon Doron of King James VI*, ed. James Craigie (Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1944), I, 143.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, I, 151–53.

¹⁸³ M. Napier, *Memoirs*, 247–48; “Anthony Bacon,” DNB.

invasion of "this Island," he had sent a list of these inventions to the English intelligence agent Anthony Bacon, who supported James's claim as hereditary successor to Queen Elizabeth. Napier boasted that he possessed the "prooffe and perfect demonstration, geometri-call and algebraicall" for his proposed submarines, tanks, machine guns, schrapnel, burning mirrors, etc. Napier probably worked with the king's military masons on these projects, while he continued to correspond with Anthony on mathematical and political subjects. In 1605, when Anthony's brother Francis Bacon urged King James to subsidize a fraternity of scientists and craftsmen, he possibly drew on Napier's experience and ambitions.

However, while James labored to secure the loyalty and improve the technological expertise of Scottish craftsmen, he recognized that their xenophobia and resistance to change made his reforms difficult to carry out. As he warned Henry,

... the Craftes-men thinke, we should be content with their worke, howe bad and deare so ever it be: & if they in anything be controlled, up goeth the blew-blanket. But for their part take example by England, how it hath flourished both in wealth and policie, since the strangers Craftes-men came in among them. Therefore not only permit, but allur strangers to come heere also: taking as straite ordour for repressing the mutining of ours at them, as was done in England, at their first in-bringing there.¹⁸⁴

James evidently referred to the influx from Flanders and France of Protestant workers in textiles and decorative arts, for there was no significant presence of foreign masons in England at this time.

Given this context of James's preoccupation with the terminology and practices of craftsmen, the efforts of William Schaw to reorganize the masonic fraternity in 1598 seem part of a royalist agenda. James had earlier made Schaw Master of Ceremonies as well as Master of Works, and he had become a favorite of Queen Anne. On 28 December, the day after the masons' traditional St. John's day festival, appeared the first "Schaw Statutes," in which the architect laid out the methods of initiating and training masons and of unifying the lodges under a national warden—who was announced to be Schaw.¹⁸⁵ The election of local wardens by master masons (the

¹⁸⁴ James VI, *Basilikon*, 93.

¹⁸⁵ George Draffen, "The Schaw Statutes," *AQC*, 94 (1981), 138–40; Stevenson, *Origins*, 34–51.

practice referred to by James earlier) was approved, though it was not clear how the national warden was appointed.

The difficult question of the relation of masonic lodges to the burgh incorporations, which were often dominated by radical Presbyterians hostile to the court, was solved by Schaw's new lodge system. As Stevenson explains,

Masons could retain membership of incorporations for the advantages this brought them within burghs, while through lodges they could have their own organizations outside the control of the burgh councils. Only masons would be members—or at least if others were allowed in this process would be controlled by masons themselves. Thus through lodges the masons asserted their right to their own autonomous organizations, established by themselves without seal of cause or other authorisation from outside the craft. In such lodges they could seek to regulate their craft without intervention by others, and value and develop their own secret legends and rituals.¹⁸⁶

Schaw also emphasized the prohibition of working with *cowans*, now defined as uninitiated men, for "He wanted masons to be an exclusive body of men qualified as masons both through training in trade skills and through initiation to the esoteric lore of the craft."

In 1599 Schaw's collaborator Alexander Seton was appointed by the king to serve as provost of Edinburgh. He opened the way for more master masons to become mason-burgesses and masters of the incorporation—thus increasing their political power. On 28 December appeared the Second Schaw Statutes, issued from Holyrood Palace, in which Schaw promised that James VI—when he returned to town—would authorize the privileges, rules, and penalties for the craft. Perhaps as a move to centralize control of the regional lodges, the lodge of Edinburgh was granted priority as number one, with the ancient lodge of Kilwinning in a secondary position. This infringement on traditional status provoked a lingering controversy. In an attempt to palliate the kirk, local wardens were made answerable to the local Presbyteries (district courts of the church) for offenses committed by masons in their lodges and resultant fines would be put to pious uses. Probably in response to complaints about his innovations, Schaw emphasized the antiquity and tradition of various regulations.

However, as Stevenson argues, the most important innovation—or revival—was the requirement that the warden must test every

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., 40.

entered apprentice "in the art of memorie and science thair of."¹⁸⁷ At Kilwinning, the warden must elect six masons, "the maist perfyte and worthies of memorie," to "tak tryall of the qualification of the haill masonis . . . of thair art, craft, scyance, and antient memorie." Though Stevenson suggests that Schaw "was deliberately introducing Renaissance influences into the craft," he also concedes that "the statutes speak of it as something long established." Kahler notes that "it cannot be ruled out that Schaw used the traditions of medieval lodges as a prototype for his new lodges," while he added "his own blend of ideas and Renaissance thought."¹⁸⁸ The medieval art of Memory included Lullist techniques, while the current science of Memory included Brunonian theories—especially the belief in Pythagorean numbers as "building blocks deeply embedded in the essence of being as it is perceived by the mind," which can be visualized through proper training.¹⁸⁹

The seventeenth-century claim that the Mason Word possessed occult powers was probably rooted in Schaw's emphasis on the art and science of Memory. Though his overture to the Presbyteries gained the kirk's acceptance of reorganized masonry, his stress on the Lullist-Brunonian Art may have roused suspicions of Papist magic among more stringent Protestants. Because there is no surviving evidence that James VI actually authorized the Second Schaw Statutes, Stevenson surmises that the king did not approve the innovations. However, the statutes certainly reflected James's current interests and ambitions. Thus, it seems more likely that opposition within the lodges presented obstacles to Schaw's new agenda.

On 8 June 1600 Schaw held a meeting of the Edinburgh lodge "as principal warden and chief master of masons" at Holyroodhouse.¹⁹⁰ He was accompanied by John Boswell, laird of Auchinleck (ancestor of the eighteenth-century James Boswell, Freemason and biographer of Samuel Johnson). With the assistance of this "gentleman" Mason, Schaw conducted a trial of the local lodge warden and imposed a heavy fine on him for some unspecified misconduct. Along with twelve master masons, Boswell signed his mason's mark to the

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., 45, 49–50, 87–96.

¹⁸⁸ Lisa Kahler, "Freemasonry in Edinburgh, 1721–1746" (Ph.D. Dissertation, St. Andrews University, 1998), 31. Her supervisor was Professor Stevenson.

¹⁸⁹ H. Gatti, *Bruno*, 185.

¹⁹⁰ D. Stevenson, *First Freemasons*, 24–25, and *Origins*, 197–98.

minutes. Stevenson suggests that Boswell was invited as a representative of the ancient lodge of Kilwinning and that the trial was an effort to reinforce Schaw's role as national warden and general supervisor of local lodges.

The reluctance of some masons to accept Schaw's "innovations" was perhaps exacerbated by Presbyterian resentment at the increasing prominence of Alexander Dickson, Catholic master of the Brunonian science, who regained favor at court in 1598.¹⁹¹ Dickson had recently used Thomas Basson's crypto-Famelist press to publish *Thamus* (Leiden, 1597), "a magic art of memory," imitated from Bruno, which included "an elaborate defence of Dicson."¹⁹² English spies reported to Queen Elizabeth that Dickson, "professor of the art of memory," was working with James on a treatise to "advance the King's title" to Elizabeth's crown.¹⁹³ Even worse, Dickson—"an enemy to your [English] state"—was to be sent on a secret mission to the Low Countries, at the same time that the Catholic Lord Seton would be sent to France. Thus, as Schaw ordered that all masons be instructed in Memory, the most famous teacher of the Art in Scotland was publicly associated with the "heretical" Bruno, who had earlier denigrated the iconoclastic Calvinists of Scotland and England and who was currently in prison in Italy. Among the Inquisition's charges against Bruno was his establishment of a secret society of "Giordanisti" among Lutherans in Germany, who would labor to build a Temple of Wisdom in which the Egyptian-Hermetic religion would overcome religious divisions.¹⁹⁴

Yates speculates that Bruno's theosophy and organizing work were somehow linked with early Freemasonry, but she was unaware of the Scottish context of this development. While she pictures Bruno standing in post-Reformation Oxford and deploring the destruction of the exquisite architecture, magical philosophy, and ecumenical philanthropy of the medieval world, she argues that the Brunonian synthesis emerged in only one institution—Freemasonry. However, she admits to "fumbling in the dark here," because

¹⁹¹ J. Durkan, "Dickson," 188.

¹⁹² Jan Van Dorsten, "Garter Knights and Familists," *Journal of European Studies*, 4 (1974), 180, 186.

¹⁹³ *CSP. Relating to Scotland and Mary, Queen of Scots, 1547–1603* (Edinburgh, 1969), I, 167, 216, 219, 335, 353.

¹⁹⁴ F. Yates, *Art of Memory*, 303, and *Bruno*, 112–13.

... Freemasonry does not appear in England as a recognisable institution until the early seventeenth century, but it certainly had predecessors, antecedents, traditions of some kind going back much earlier, although this is a most obscure subject.¹⁹⁵

From Stevenson's work, which fills in the missing Scottish background for Yates's thesis, it becomes clear that James VI and Schaw were pursuing a potentially unpopular course in their masonic (Brunonian?) reform program.

At this time, James's relations with Queen Elizabeth were strained, and rumors circulated that he was secretly negotiating with Spanish and Irish Catholics. Perhaps Schaw, Seton, and the Catholic builders hoped to import Continental (and Irish) masons to improve the expertise and artistry of their local lodges. Such a move would automatically provoke charges of Papism by wary Presbyterians. In 1601 an English spy reported that James was collaborating with Dickson on an apology for the recent execution of a Catholic, on grounds of theft not religion, in order "to avoid the loss of the Papists and keep them yet for their advantage."¹⁹⁶ Thus, the arts of masonry and memory took on suspiciously Catholic overtones.

That Schaw's program did run into opposition is suggested by the First St. Clair Charter, drawn up in 1600-01, in which the St. Clairs of Roslin were recognized as the hereditary patrons and protectors of the masons:

Be it known to all men by their present letters, us deacons, masters, and freemen of the masons within the realm of Scotland, with express consent and assent of William Schaw, master of work to our Sovereign Lord; ... as from age to age, it has been observed amongst us and our privileges, like as our predecessors has obeyed and acknowledged them as patrons and protectors, while that within their few years, through negligence and slothfulness, the same has passed forth of use, whereby not only has the laird of Roslin [lain] out of just right, but also our whole craft has been destitute of a patron and protector and overseer, which has engendered many false corruptions and imperfections, both among ourselves and in our craft, and has given occasion to many persons to conceive evil among us and our craft, and leave off great enterprises of policie, by reason of our great misbehavior, without correction, whereby not only the committers of the faults, but also the honest men, are disappointed of their craft and

¹⁹⁵ Ibid., 274.

¹⁹⁶ J. Mackie, *Calendar*, II, 835.

profit; as likewise when diverse and sundry controversies fall out amongst ourselves . . .¹⁹⁷

Though Schaw signed the charter, he did not call himself general warden, for William St. Clair of Roslin and his heirs were now named patron and judge of the masons, "at the hands of our Sovereine Lord."

The royal support given to St. Clair is provocative, for he was a staunch Catholic who was constantly at loggerheads with the Presbyterians. He struggled to protect the flamboyantly Gothic chapel at Roslin, but in 1592 a band of Protestants smashed the altars in the church. Perhaps the masons employed by St. Clair at this time helped him prevent further damage, for many of the fantastically carved figures were allowed to survive. Among these are a plethora of Hermetic and Templar emblems. When called before the Presbytery, the defiant St. Clair proclaimed that "he was as happy to face a hundred ministers as one." Stevenson suggests that his attempt to protect Roslin church won him respect even from Protestant masons, "reluctant to see the great works of their predecessors destroyed."¹⁹⁸

The St. Clair family had long assumed the role of conservators of Scotland's ancient heritage which stretched back to the myths of Gathelus and Scota in Egypt. In the previous generation, Sir William St. Clair tried to preserve the scholarly productions of the Middle Ages, and he collected many manuscripts "which had been taken by the rabble out of our monasterys at the time of reformation."¹⁹⁹ Among these were Hermetic-Egyptian magical treatises from Gothic times. Despite the stringent laws passed by the Reformers against gypsies, St. Clair made them welcome at Roslin, and "he delivered once ane Egyptian from the gibbet." It is perhaps relevant that the gypsies were believed to possess the occult secrets of the ancient Egyptians, which they preserved through the Middle Ages. That the Art of Memory as practiced by Bruno, Dickson, and their Scottish disciples was called an Egyptian-Cabalistic art would have enhanced it among the traditionalist masons (both Catholic and Protestant) who worked at Roslin for the St. Clair family.

The transference of supreme masonic power to William St. Clair was clearly a sign of royal recognition of the traditional claims and

¹⁹⁷ R.A. Hay, *Genealogie*, 157–58. Spelling modernized.

¹⁹⁸ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 56.

¹⁹⁹ R. Hay, *Genealogie*, 136.

lore of Scottish masonry. Though St. Clair was reportedly a "lewd man," who kept a miller's daughter, his devotion to emblematic architecture and the persecuted upholders of ancient magical traditions (be they Templars or "Egyptians") earned him the respect of his fellow masons. From this turbulent period of masonic reorganization, undertaken by architecturally-gifted Catholics like Schaw, Seton, and St. Clair (who swore loyalty to their Protestant king), an organization emerged that earned the name of "Freemasonry." Though Stevenson may overstate the case when he dates this transformation of medieval masonry into modern Masonry from Schaw's Statutes, it is clear that this development took place in Scotland and not in England. To distinguish between traditional operative masonry and the new Stuart Freemasonry, I will henceforth use small versus capital letters when referring to them—i.e., *masonry* versus *Masonry*/*Freemasonry*.

Three decades after James's death, the Freemasons at Perth would claim that the king, by his "own desire was entered Freeman Mason and Fellow Craft" in the Lodge of Scone.²⁰⁰ As noted earlier, James may have privately joined the fraternity (as an apprentice?) some years before. According to Anderson, the king was made a "Brother Mason" by Claud Hamilton, Lord Paisley, the Grand Master, who continued in office until 1603.²⁰¹ Anderson evidently based the claim on Hamilton family tradition, for Paisley was the "Progenitor of our late Grand Master Abercorn" (a reference to James Hamilton, Lord Paisley and Earl of Abercorn, Grand Master of England in 1725–26). Claud Hamilton was the nephew of John Hamilton, archbishop of St. Andrews, a supporter of Queen Mary, and son-in-law of George, Sixth Lord Seton.²⁰² After James recalled him from France, he privately converted to Catholicism. Thus, if Anderson's claim is true, another moderate Catholic joined Schaw in Masonic leadership.

Though the date of the lodge meeting at Scone is unknown, it possibly took place in November 1601, when James was made a burgess at Perth, or in March, 1602, during another royal visit to Perth when the local masons were planning to build a new stone

²⁰⁰ See the Masonic document (Perth, 24 December 1658) in R. Mylne, *Master Masons*, 128–30 (spelling modernized). In *The First Freemasons*, 103, Stevenson expresses scepticism about James's initiation, but I see no reason to reject the assertion of the Perth Masons, who would soon work for James's grandson Charles II.

²⁰¹ J. Anderson, *Constitutions* (1738), 91, 119–20.

²⁰² "Claud Hamilton, Lord Paisley," *DNB*.

bridge over the Tay.²⁰³ Perhaps Schaw, who served on the bridge commission, arranged for James's entrance into the lodge. One of the Masters of Work appointed to the construction project was James Adamson, whose kinsman Henry Adamson would later write the Masonic poem, *The Muses Threnodie*. The poet placed the burgess ceremony within a context of praise for mathematical and architectural expertise. After praising the art of Master Dickson, "that rare ingeniour, skill'd in every part/Of mathematics," who raised the sunken ship of Wallace, and that of the early stonemasons who built "a snout of great square stones," which controlled flood waters, the panegyrist of Perth boasted that "of all privileges this is the bravest":

King James the sixth was burgess made and provost,
And gave his burgess oath, and did enrole
With his own hand within the burgess scrole
And Guildry book his dear and worthy name,
Which doth remain to Perth's perpetual fame,
And that king's glorie . . .²⁰⁴

According to the Perth chirurgion George Ruthven, who kissed the king's hand that day, James also demonstrated prophetic powers, for he predicted that one day "Perth's provost London's mayor shall command!" From the poet's Masonic perspective, perhaps the king was credited with second sight.

James's admission to the guild of burgesses and to the lodge of Freemasons was consistent with his determination to build a supportive political base among the artisan class, while pacifying Scotland's religious factions. Unfortunately, the untimely death of Schaw in 1602 and the movement of James VI to London in 1603 means that we know little about subsequent Masonic development in Scotland. However, Schaw's tradition was carried on by his "true-hearted friend" Alexander Seton, who wrote that Schaw "excelled in architecture":

Princes in particular esteemed him for his conspicuous gifts. Alike in his professional work and in affairs he was not merely tireless and indomitable but consistently earnest and upright. His innate capacity for service and for laying others under an obligation won for him the admiration of every good man who knew him.²⁰⁵

²⁰³ R. Mylne, *Master Masons*, 89.

²⁰⁴ H. Adamson, *Muses Threnodie*, 74.

²⁰⁵ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 26.

Did Schaw use Masonic oaths to lay his brothers under obligations of loyal service to their country and king? Certainly, in the decades ahead, that Masonic technique of mystical bonding would be utilized in the service of Scottish nationalist as well as royalist causes.

In 1603, in anticipation of his accession to the English throne, James ordered the publication and wide distribution of *Basilikon Doron*, which had earlier been limited to seven privately printed copies.²⁰⁶ When he issued again his criticism of close-minded and recalcitrant craftsmen, the king perhaps remembered the struggles of Schaw and St. Clair to regenerate Freemasonry as an "illuminated" fraternity and to preserve and build anew the beautiful architecture of Scotland. Though the king eagerly left behind the fractious nobles and carping Presbyterians of the north, he entered his southern kingdom with the self-imposed title of "Scotland's Solomon." To later Freemasons, he would also earn the title of "Mason King," and the efforts of himself and his descendants to carry on the Masonic traditions of their ancestral home would ramify into the secret histories of many countries.

²⁰⁶ D. Mathew, *James I*, 81.

CHAPTER FIVE

"GREAT BRITAIN'S SOLOMON": REBUILDING THE TEMPLE IN THE SOUTH (1603–1616)

... upon her [Elizabeth's] Demise, King James VI of Scotland succeeding to the Crown of England, being a Mason King, reviv'd the English lodges; and as he was the First King of Great-Britain, he was also the First Prince in the World that recover'd the Roman Architecture from the Ruins of Gothick Ignorance . . .

—James Anderson, *Constitutions of the Freemasons* (1723)

In early 1603, as James contemplated the imminent death of Queen Elizabeth, he reassured his English correspondents that he would uphold the established Church of England and keep it strongly Protestant. However, Lockyer observes that James was by nature tolerant and believed that persecution was one of the infallible notes of a false church.¹ He hoped to end Elizabeth's policy which tarred with the brush of treachery the harmless majority of Catholics, when only a fanatical minority were cause for concern. He promised that he would not persecute any Catholics who "will be quiet and give but an outward obedience to the law" and that he would advance those who "by good service worthily deserve it." He had no intention of presiding over a Catholic revival nor of accepting Papal supremacy as long as the Pope claimed the right to depose monarchs. As James would soon learn, his moderate policy—which seems humane and enlightened to modern students—would place him at odds with the near-fanatical anti-Catholicism of the majority of his new subjects. Moreover, this gap in attitudes about toleration would ramify into the transfer of Scottish Freemasonry to England.

After Elizabeth's death on 24 March, the new king prepared to lead a royal entourage from Edinburgh to London. He felt confident that the northern capitol was in good hands, for Alexander Seton would remain provost of the city. Though William Schaw, the close

¹ R. Lockyer, *James VI and I*, 124–25, 133. Lockyer's chapter, "A Godly Prince," provides an important revisionist analysis of James's religious policies.

collaborator of James and Seton in architectural and political affairs, had died, the king sensed that the Masonic reform initiated by Schaw and the policy of religious conciliation maintained by Seton would ensure the peace in Scotland. Just before the king left, however, John Johnston expressed the popular fear that James VI and I would forget his Scottish roots and Scotland's traditional independence. In a tactful reminder entitled *A Trewe Description of the Nobill Race of the Stewards* (1603), Johnston proudly placed a poetic tribute to the Egyptian origins of the ancient Scots before his genealogy of the Stewart monarchs.

But Gathelus and Scota did not appear in the elaborate, emblematic displays that greeted "James I," when he made a royal progress through London in March 1604. English poets and designers portrayed him as the heir of Brutus, the Trojan founder of England, who had long been featured in English imperialist propaganda. An alternative view was expressed by the dramatist Ben Jonson, a Catholic convert, who paid greater homage to James as a philosopher king, whose unified kingdoms of Great Britain would be supported by "Theosophia, or divine Wisedome."² Jonson was aware of the new king's interest in architecture, and he directed the construction of triumphal arches which "represented the earliest acknowledged application of the principles of harmonic proportion to architecture in England":

Each arch was a series of ratios . . . which depended on the Pythagorean-Platonic division of the musical scale. The first arch was the Tuscan order, "being the principal pillar of those five upon which the Noble Frame of Architecture doth stand."³

Despite this patronage-seeking tribute, Jonson could not resist making anti-Scottish jokes about James and his northern courtiers, which earned him popular plaudits but royal displeasure. The king was soon forced to recognize the chauvinistic hostility of many Englishmen to Scottish manners and traditions. His own uninhibited affability was deemed boorish by the more class-conscious English courtiers, for as Stevenson observes:

² Graham Parry, *The Golden Age Restor'd: The Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603-42* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1983), 1-9.

³ John Harris, Stephen Orgel, and Roy Strong, *The King's Arcadia: Inigo Jones and the Stuart Court* (London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1973), 23.

The Scots prided themselves on a degree of robustness and informality in relations between men of different rank . . . Such informality might be acceptable in Scotland, but it grated in England, where the trend was towards greater formality of manners, more emphasis on outward show of deference from inferiors, and towards haughty, withdrawn coldness from superiors determined to exact such deference.⁴

A bitter English memoirist would later claim that "this nation was rooted up by those Caledonian bores."⁵

James also found the architectural design of English palaces unsuitable for the Scottish tradition of easy access between subject and king. As noted earlier, the French and Scottish masons who built Falkland and Stirling castles embodied this royalist egalitarianism in the layout of rooms. Now determined to divide offices equally between English and Scots, James accepted the London tradition of a Privy Chamber, which he made "half English, half Scots, two stages removed from the king."⁶ However, he reserved the Bedchamber exclusively for Scots, "agents whom he could trust, companions with whom he was familiar"—a move aimed at his personal security. Though he made access to the Privy Chamber much more open than in the past, he used the Bedchamber door as "the key filter in restricting access to him."⁷

The Scots soon learned that their proud identification with the ancient Jews was the target of English mockers, as was the Scottish Solomon's "Judaized" aversion to pork.⁸ James's earnest attempt to discuss his studies in magic, witchcraft, and second sight provoked amused scorn from an early English visitor.⁹ These negative reactions influenced the king's penchant for secrecy and caution, while he tried to understand and manage an overcrowded, unruly Parliament. James would later explain his wary approach in suggestively Masonic terms, especially when he made his long-delayed, first speech to Parliament:

When I came into England, although I was an old King, past middle age, and practised in government ever since I was twelve years

⁴ D. Stevenson, "English Devil," 131.

⁵ Francis Osborne, *Traditional Memoyres of the Raigne of James I* (London, 1658); rpt. in W. Scott, *Secret History*, I, 217.

⁶ N. Cuddy, "Revival," 176–78.

⁷ D. Stevenson, "English Devil," 133.

⁸ A. Williamson, "A Pil," 245–47.

⁹ J. Harington, *Letters*, 110–11.

old, yet being here a stranger in governement . . . I resolved therefore with Pythagoras to keep silence seven years, and learn myself the laws of this Kingdom, before I would take upon me to teach them unto others: When this Apprenticeship was ended, then another impediment came . . . And now having passed a double apprenticeship of twice seven years, I am come hither to speak unto you.¹⁰

James's assumption of the role of apprentice in Pythagorean initiation added further Masonic resonance to his conception of the craft of kingship.

While James bided his time in Pythagorean silence before a hostile Parliament, he attracted fellow initiates of the Masonic arts and sciences to his southern court. Though the Memory master Dickson was dead by 1604, another practitioner of the art—the poet William Fowler—accompanied Queen Anne to London. They were joined by John Florio, who had known and admired Bruno and Dickson.¹¹ Florio served as Italian reader and secretary to the queen, and he drew heavily on Bruno's works for the Italian-English dictionary he was preparing for her. Fowler's close friend Robert Kerr came south to join Prince Henry's household, where he pursued his interests in architecture, alchemy, and Hebrew lore.¹² A great bibliophile, Kerr acquired Bruno's works and took great interest in Florio's work for Queen Anne. The royal family liked and admired Kerr, who became a Gentleman of the Privy Chamber to the prince and received a knighthood from the king in 1605. As we shall see, Kerr would later provide an important link between Scottish Freemasonry and Rosicrucianism.

James also invited Schaw's successor as Master of Works, Sir David Cunningham of Robertland, to join the Scottish courtiers in London.¹³ Cunningham had served with Schaw in the queen's household and presumably fulfilled his predecessor's requirement that he be expert in the Art of Memory. That Cunningham's descendants were active in seventeenth-century lodges suggests a family tradition of Masonic

¹⁰ James VI and I, *Political Works of James I*, 328. Spelling modernized.

¹¹ Frances Yates, *John Florio* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1934), 87, 110–14, 265.

¹² Robert Kerr, *Correspondence of Sir Robert Kerr, First Earl of Ancrum, and his Son, William, Third Earl of Lothian*, ed. David Laing. Roxburghe Club Publications, 100. (Edinburgh, 1875), I, viii–ix; II, Appendix, 487. Kerr's architectural and Rosicrucian interests will be discussed later.

¹³ John Summerson, *Architecture in Britain, 1530–1830* (London: Penguin, 1953), 26, 105; D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 61.

initiation. Among James's Pythagorean silences may have been his affiliation with Scottish Freemasonry, for he would find no equivalent institution in his southern kingdom. Queen Elizabeth had always been a reluctant builder, and her Office of Works was "scarcely more than a maintenance department."¹⁴ Allegedly hostile to any organization by masons, she had allowed "irregularities and speculation" to develop in the building trade. Knoop observes that by the early years of the seventeenth century, "the operative lodges in England had virtually disappeared, while in Scotland they still played a substantial part in controlling affairs of the trade."¹⁵

With little royal or ecclesiastical construction, English builders were mainly employed on private courtiers' residences. The most impressive court architecture consisted of "rural prodigy houses erected by provincial craftsmen."¹⁶ Among the few emblematic buildings constructed of newly hewn stone were those designed in Northampton by Sir Thomas Tresham, a staunch Catholic and grandson of the last Grand Prior of the Hospitallers in England.¹⁷ Though Tresham was a loyal citizen and disapproved of Spanish aggression, he was repeatedly imprisoned by Elizabeth for his religious beliefs. It was reported that his confiscated papers included "some mystical notes on the Trinity with a ridiculous account of a miracle which happened to him."¹⁸ During his intervals of freedom, Tresham determined to embody in symbolic architecture the spiritual and chivalric values of his ancestors. Airs observes with some puzzlement that his "frenzy" to build was "almost frightening in its intensity."¹⁹ However, Tresham's belief in the magical significance of architecture would have been understood north of the border.

In 1593–95 Tresham designed the unusual Triangular Lodge at Rushton, which featured a motto carved in stone—"The Treshams bear witness." Girouard notes that in England the diminutive "lodge"

¹⁴ H. Colvin, *History*, III, part 1, 108.

¹⁵ Quoted in Harry Carr, "A Collection of References to the Mason Word," *AQC*, 85 (1972), 218.

¹⁶ R. Malcolm Smuts, *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania UP, 1987), 54.

¹⁷ "Sir Thomas Tresham," *DNB*; J. Summerson, *Architecture*, 41–42.

¹⁸ J. Alfred Gotch, *A Complete Account of the Buildings Erected in Northamptonshire by Sir Thomas Tresham Between the Years 1575 and 1605* (London: B.T. Batsford, 1883), 7.

¹⁹ Malcolm Airs, *The Making of the English Country House, 1500–1640* (London: Architectural Press, 1975), 14, 26.

was often built in isolated places, away from the main house, and evoked "an aura of secrecy" which drew on the medieval tradition of keeping a "secret house."²⁰ Tresham's triangular building was actually a place for feasting, "an especially fanciful and beautiful banqueting house rather than a lodge." A defiant statement of Trinitarian Catholicism, Tresham's lodge also featured carved emblems of mystical geometry and theosophical Cabala (i.e., circles with triangles inside, triple rosettes, seven-branched candlesticks, seven eyes of God, dove with ouroboros, divine hand on glove, etc.).²¹ For these, he drew on Spanish-Jesuit interpretations of the First and Second Temples of Jerusalem, which provided trinitarian allegories of Jewish architecture and ornaments.²² Interested in the Art of Memory, he acquired Marafiot's *Ars Memoria*, in which the names of Hebrew prophets, David, Solomon, and Melchizedek were attached to mnemonic figures and concepts.²³ Familiar with the architecture of Camillo's Memory Theater, he also commissioned designs that bore a striking resemblance to Lullist Memory wheels. Among his Protestant neighbors, rumors circulated that he practised black magic and used the emblematic stone carvings as talismans.

In order to prepare the highly finished ashlar stonework of the Triangular Lodge, Tresham employed Robert Stickells, a self-described "freemason," who had been frustrated in his attempts to become Surveyor in the English Office of Works. Stickells shared his patron's devotion to symbolic architecture, so that "almost every stone" was "pregnant with allegorical meaning."²⁴ Tresham amassed a remarkable collection of European books on architecture, which he made available to Stickells, whose familiarity with Vitruvian principles was rare among English artisans during Elizabeth's reign.²⁵ Though the iconoclasm of the Reformation provoked resistance in England to the revival of Vitruvianism on the Continent, Smuts notes that the

²⁰ Mark Girouard, *Life in the English Country House* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1980), 106–08, plate 9.

²¹ J. Gotch, *Tresham*, 21–25.

²² He was especially influenced by Francisci Ribera's *De Templo* (Antwerp: Petrum Bellerum, 1593).

²³ Hieronymo Marafiot, *Ars Memoriae* (Frankfurt, 1602–03), I, 1, 51, 55. His library catalogue is in the British Library: Tresham Papers, Vol. III, Add. MSS. 39830.f.191v.

²⁴ Malcolm Airs, *The Buildings of Britain: Tudor and Jacobean* (London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1982), 17.

²⁵ A.W. Johnson, *Ben Jonson: Poetry and Architecture* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 26.

problem lay deeper—"in the unwillingness of all but a few Elizabethan aristocrats to regard painting, sculpture, and architecture as subjects worth serious intellectual attention":

The Tudor elite did not much concern itself with skills regarded as purely manual in nature. The role of a gentleman was to enjoy the labor of others, not to inquire too curiously into how artisans earned their wages. Social prejudice therefore inhibited interest in the fine arts . . .

. . . A nobleman building a house, for example, often suggested features he wanted incorporated and the general layout of the plan, but he rarely attempted to draw up detailed elevations. Normally a great house still remained a matter for improvisation . . .²⁶

Tresham's architectural activities and ambitions resembled those of aristocratic Scottish builders, who did not hesitate to direct and participate in the full range of architectural tasks. From his readings in Boece and other Scottish historians, he knew of the Stewart kings' interest in symbolic architecture, operative masonry, and chivalric orders. His fascination with complex stone sundials—à la Napier and Mylne—suggests further Scottish masonic influence. Thus, on 25 March 1603, when Tresham enthusiastically proclaimed James I at Northampton, he must have hoped for a masonic revival in England as well as an era of religious toleration. He soon designed another allegorical lodge (Lyveden, New Build), symbolising the Passion, with sophisticated architectural details supplied from London by Stickells, who now found employment among James's architecturally-ambitious courtiers.²⁷ Tresham believed the Scottish king would implement various practical reforms, and he sent his son to serve James at the court in London.²⁸ Unlike Elizabeth, James treated Tresham well and believed he was a loyal and valuable citizen.

Soon after James's arrival in London, he was informed about the deterioration of the Office of Works, which was currently supervised by an aged mason, William Spicer. Thus, he ordered his own Master of Works, Sir David Cunningham, to share the position of Surveyor with Spicer. That Cunningham was viewed as "this Scottish intruder" suggests the hostility that alien visions of architecture and masonry

²⁶ M. Smuts, *Court*, 145.

²⁷ M. Airs, *Buildings*, 17.

²⁸ *CSP. Domestic Series, of the Reign of James I, 1603–1610* (London, 1857), VIII, 136, 171, 223, 269.

provoked in the demoralized Elizabethan office.²⁹ It was probably Tresham who recommended John Thorpe, son of a Northampton mason and talented carver of mystical emblems, to the court. Like Stickells, Thorpe had been disappointed in his hope of promotion under Elizabeth. The new king was soon shocked and disgusted by the crowded, tumble-down state of London housing, for the wooden and thatch materials constantly caught fire. Thus, he launched an early architectural offensive. Driven out of London by the plague that spread rapidly through the congested city, James issued orders from Woodstock in September 1603 that strictly regulated building practices.³⁰ A few months later, he granted a royal charter to "the freemasons, carpenters, joiners, and slaters" of Oxford.³¹

However, in London, the Puritan members of Parliament were distrustful of James's tolerance towards Catholics and parsimonious with financial grants. Thus, his architectural ambitions needed the propagandist support of repeated Solomonic manifestos. In October 1604 John Gordon, a Scotsman newly appointed as dean of Salisbury, delivered a sermon before the king in which he laid out several Masonic themes. Immediately published as *Enotikon, or a Sermon of the Union of Great Britain, in Antiquitie of Language, Name, Religion, and Kingdome*, the oration explored the Hebrew roots of "Brittania" and the symbolism of Solomon's Temple. In contrast to the Brutus myth, Gordon argued that Britanni, Scoti, and Hebernii all derived from Hebrew and represented the scattered descendants of Japhet. Now James has united them in "our generall name *Brit-an-iah*," a Hebrew composite, and will rule the unified kingdoms in the Davidic-Solomonic tradition.³² Gordon then surveyed the fate of the Temple of Jerusalem, making pointed analogies to the fate of Britain. Though he stressed the role of Solomon in building the Temple in a spiritual Jerusalem, he was also determined to undertake actual masonic projects for the king—especially the needed repairs on the great Gothic cathedral at Salisbury.

James's show of favor to Gordon was significant, for the erudite Scotsman represented many of the proclivities most feared by the

²⁹ J. Summerson, *Architecture*, 26–27.

³⁰ Norman Brett-James, *The Growth of Stuart London* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1935), 80.

³¹ D. Knope and R. Jones, *Mediaeval Mason*, 232.

³² John Gordon, *Enotikon* (London: George Bishop, 1604), 22–26, 33–41.

radical Protestants in Scotland and England.³³ Born a Catholic, Gordon converted to Protestantism but remained loyal to Mary Queen of Scots. In France he served in the household of Henri de Navarre, where he befriended Du Bartas and collected many of his works.³⁴ Like Du Bartas, Gordon was fascinated by Hebrew studies and Cabalistic lore, which he demonstrated in public debates with the chief rabbi of Avignon. James was so impressed by Gordon's Hebraic and Hermetic erudition that he invited him to London in 1603 and promptly appointed him dean of Salisbury, despite English suspicions that he was a crypto-Catholic. Gordon shared with James an interest in the Cabalistic concept of marriage as an act of sacramental and cosmic sexuality—a theme sketched out in *Basilikon Doron* but more fully developed in *Enotikon*. James advised his son Henry that fornication and adultery prevent “entry in that spirituall and heavenly Jerusalem,” while conjugal union restores “the Temple of the holie spirite.”³⁵ Using Hebrew etymologies, Gordon expanded the Cabalistic marriage metaphor to an architectural analogy of the relation of king to kingdom:

This word Kingdome doth containe in it Cities; and Citie, houses; and House, man and woman; . . . by that order of doctrine which doth proceed *ab imo ad summum*, from the lowest to the highest, which is the order Architectonicke of building. By the union of man and woman is made the lowest degree of societie, which is here called a House; by the union and conjunction of many houses, doth proceed the second degree and estate of mankind, which is called Citie; and last, by the union of many cities doth come the third and highest degree of societie, which is comprehended under the word Kingdome.

In the exposition of this text we meane . . . to gather some wholesome and fruitful doctrine of the mysticall signification of these three words out of the auncient originall Hebrew language. These words . . . in the originall language have a certaine hid doctrine, which doth expresse and signifie that which is most wholsome and profitable to the felicitie and happinesse of all men. We must first beginne at the words that signifie man and woman, by whose union a house is made . . . God dwelleth in the middle of man; that is, his soule and minde; even as the letter *jod* which signifieth God, is in the middle of the Hebrew

³³ Dorothy Quinn, “The Career of John Gordon, Dean of Salisbury, 1603–1619,” *The Historian*, 6 (1943), 76–96; “John Gordon, D.D.,” *DNB*.

³⁴ Many of Gordon's books were acquired by his son-in-law; see *A Catalogue of the Singular and Curious Library, originally formed between 1610 and 1650, by Sir Robert Gordon, of Gordonstoun* (London, 1816).

³⁵ James VI, *Basilikon Doron*, I, 123, 125.

word *isch*, that signifieth *man*. The word that signifieth *woman* in Hebrew is *ischah*; which is made by the growing or augmenting of the letter *He*, to the foresayd word *Isch*, that signifieth man . . . This blessed conjunction of man and woman in the holie bond of marriage doth make a house.³⁶

Continuing his Hebraic linguistic manipulations, Gordon concluded with a paean to James as "the fountaine or water of life," who fertilizes his bride-kingdom. It is possible that the secret instruction in Cabalistic sexual theosophy which emerged in later Freemasonry was already present at the time of Gordon's bizarre sermons. Encouraged by James, who frequently invited him to preach at court, Gordon expanded his Cabalistic interpretations of Hebrew letters and numbers to support James's ecclesiastical policies. In April 1605 a Puritan critic complained:

Deane Gordon, preaching before the kinge, is comme so farre about in matter of ceremonies, that out of Ezechiell and other places of the prophets, and by certain hebrue characters, and other cabalisticall collections, he hath founde out and approved the use of crosse cap and surplis et ct.³⁷

The notion of the Stuart monarch as a Solomonic-Pythagorean king was reinforced by the 1605 English edition of Du Bartas's *Divine Weeks*, which was dedicated to James by the translator Sylvester. The dedication featured an architectural poem in the shape of two pillars that form a temple and another that forms a pyramid—both emblematic of the Temple of Jerusalem.³⁸ When Sylvester entered Prince Henry's service, he reinforced the royalist-masonic notions advocated by James and Du Bartas. Since childhood, Henry had been trained in the arts of military masonry; thus, he was aware that the king's Master of Works in Scotland, Sir James Murray, also served as king's master gunner in 1605.³⁹ Ten years later, Murray's son and successor would officially add the office of master gunner to that of Master of Works.

While the king and his partisans vigorously asserted his Solomonic agenda, James lamented the sorry state of architecture and city planning in London. In 1605 he issued an order that buildings were no

³⁶ J. Gordon, *Enotikon*, 2–3.

³⁷ V. Hart, *Art and Magic*, 48.

³⁸ G. Parry, *Golden Age*, 24.

³⁹ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 112.

longer to be constructed with wooden fronts but must have stone or brick facings.⁴⁰ James's edict aimed at more than fire prevention, for he hoped to develop architectural uniformity for aesthetic reasons as well. The current dilapidation of St. Paul's church was a special embarrassment, and it was scorned by Continental visitors as an emblem of the degraded state of English Protestantism. James was well aware that in Spain the Catholic monarch Philip II had earlier adopted the role of Solomon and that he succeeded in building the magnificent Escorial, designed to duplicate Solomon's Temple.⁴¹ Determined to improve England's relations with Catholic nations, James signed a peace treaty with Spain, a move resented by the surviving Elizabethan war party. To the dismay of radical Protestants, James received emissaries from Madrid and studied Spanish Biblical and architectural publications.

This Spanish rapprochement was important for subsequent Masonic developments, because the late Philip II and his architects were adepts of the Lullist art, which they infused into the design and decoration of their great stone Temple. Though Philip had begun the Escorial project in the late 1550's, the Solomonian aspects of its plan received international publicity, when Juan Bautista Villalpando published the second volume of *In Ezechielem Explanationes et Apparatus Urbis ac Templum Hierosolymitani* (Rome, 1604). The work was subsidized by Philip III, who was praised as "the second Solomon" in the dedication. Given James's aspirations to become Great Britain's Solomon, it is not surprising that he acquired Villalpando's treatise.⁴² The author had studied under Juan de Herrera, the main architect of the Escorial, and his reconstruction of the Temple of Jerusalem was based on Herrera's design of the palace. Both architect and king were confirmed Lullists, who compiled vast collections of Cabalistic and Hermetic works. In the ritualistically prepared stones of the Escorial, they believed they were embodying not only the Cabalistic *sephiroth* but the images of a Temple of Memory—as traced out in the volumes of Lull, Camillo, Cardano, and Bruno collected in the royal library. Taylor

⁴⁰ H. Colvin, *History*, III, 140.

⁴¹ In a treatise published in 1605, Fray José de Sigüenza referred "to the new Temple of Solomon and to the fact that Philip attempted to imitate Solomon in his works"; see J. Curl, *Art and Architecture*, 88.

⁴² V. Hart, *Art and Magic*, 111.

suggests that Villalpando's Temple was intended as "a magic memory building."⁴³

Among the occult treatises collected by Philip II and his architect was the *Monas Hieroglyphica* of John Dee, who had met the Spanish king and cast his horoscope when Philip was in London with his bride, Queen Mary Tudor. Dee may also have met Herrera when both were in Flanders, for they shared strikingly similar interests in Lullist-Cabalistic mathematics and architecture.⁴⁴ Herrera, who was described as "a man of the square and plummet," gained the Spanish king's support for an academy of mathematics in Madrid, but Dee was unable to gain similar support from Queen Elizabeth. Instead, Dee became employed as Elizabeth's prime "Intelligencer," a role in which his expertise in Cabalistic angel-magic and cryptography was used to counter the military designs of Spain against England.⁴⁵

Though Dee had also used his espionage skills against Mary Queen of Scots and James VI, on the latter's accession to the English throne he hoped to gain royal favor. On 9 August 1603 Dee revised and reprinted his *Discourse Apologeticall* (1599) in order to petition James with a refutation of charges that he was a conjuror and a defense of his method of philosophical study ("to move by gradation . . . from the visible to the invisible").⁴⁶ He portrayed himself primarily as a master of mathesis, who worked to weigh, number, and measure the frame of the world. Appealing to Scotland's Solomon, Dee listed among his unpublished works a history of King Solomon and his journey to Ophir, a treatise on "Cabalae Hebraica Compendiosa," an apology for Roger Bacon, and a host of treatises on astronomy and mechanical inventions. James evidently approved of Dee's petition, for on the same day he was sworn in as the king's mathematician. Sherman stresses that "Dee actually served James in an official capacity," a point missed by other Dee scholars (such as Yates), who did not examine "the Jacobean additions" to the *Discourse*.⁴⁷

⁴³ René Taylor, "Architecture and Magic: Considerations on the *Idea* of the Escorial," in Douglas Fraser, Howard Hibbard, and Milton Lewine, eds., *Essays in the History of Architecture Presented to Rudolph Wittkower* (London: Phaidon, 1967), 99.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 84–87.

⁴⁵ Richard Deacon, *John Dee* (London: Frederick Muller, 1968), 33, 46–63, 241–43.

⁴⁶ John Dee, *A Letter nine yeeres since, written and first published, containing a discourse apologetical* (London: E. Short, 1603).

⁴⁷ William H. Sherman, *John Dee: The Politics of Reading and Writing in the English Renaissance* (Amherst: Massachusetts UP, 1995), 19, 206n.58.

After James became established in London, he moved quickly to enact more stringent laws against witchcraft in March 1604. While Parliament considered the king's request, Dee worried that he would be accused of practising black magic. Thus, on 5 June he appealed directly to James that he be allowed to defend himself in a public trial.⁴⁸ He intended to argue that his mathematical feats and angelic conjurations were lawful Christian magic and that he never invoked devils. His appeal to the king was successful enough to render unnecessary a public trial, and on 8 June he sent a verse petition to Parliament in which he signed himself "Servant and Mathematician to his most royall Majestie."⁴⁹ When Parliament enacted the witchcraft statute on 9 June, the king apparently gave instructions that Dee be left in peace.⁵⁰

While James struggled to gain financial support from a wary Parliament for his architectural and mechanical projects, he was unable or unwilling to give Dee a pension. However, the impoverished *magus* did receive support from the Napier family. In July 1604 Dr. Richard Napier of Linford in Buckinghamshire met Dee, and the two discussed the works of Lull.⁵¹ Dee probably informed his new friend about his meeting in Prague with the Spanish ambassador San Clemente, who claimed to be a lineal descendant of Lull and who gave Ewald de Hoghelande, a Dutch alchemist, the information for his biography of Lull, which Hoghelande included in *Historiae Aliquot Transmutationis Mettalicæ* (1604). Dee and Napier discussed this book, which argued against the enemies of great alchemists like Roger Bacon, Michael Scot, and Dee himself (with the *Monas Hieroglyphica* especially praised). Napier shared Dee's interest in Cabalistic angel magic, and he had earlier studied under the notorious Simon Forman, who bequeathed his manuscripts and books to his pupil. Richard Napier greatly admired Dee, and he frequently visited him and purchased books from his library at Mortlake. He would give the impoverished magus financial and moral support until his death five years later.

⁴⁸ John Dee, *To the King's Most Excellent Majestie* (London, 1604).

⁴⁹ John Dee, *To the Honourable Assemblie of the Commons in the Present Parliament* (London, 1604).

⁵⁰ R. Deacon, *Dee*, 270–71.

⁵¹ Bodleian: Ashmole MS.1488.f.21; see J. Dee, *Diaries*, 303n.3, 152, 157.

Richard Napier provided a Scottish link to Dee, for he was kinned to the Scottish Napiers, with whom he maintained close relations. From September through December 1604, Richard's nephew Sir Archibald Napier was in London, where he successfully defended his policies as Master of the Scottish Mint. Sir Archibald's nephew, also named Archibald, had a position at James's court, and he may have informed his kinsmen about Dee's petition to the king. Young Archibald was the son of John Napier, the logarithmist, who was also Richard's first cousin.⁵² The extended family often communicated about their mutual studies in alchemy, mathematics, and Jewish lore. These contacts between the Scottish circles around James and the former Elizabethan intelligencer are provocative, for Yates argues that Dee had a shadowy but significant influence on the emergence of Freemasonry in England.⁵³ Stevenson replies that there is no evidence that Dee developed his early interest in architecture in any "masonic" way nor that there were any "masonic" developments in Elizabethan England.⁵⁴ However, it is possible that Dee influenced the Napier family, who in turn effected the development of Freemasonry in Scotland and subsequently in Jacobean England. We will return to the Dee-Napier connection when we examine James's frustrations with London architects and masons in 1607.

It is also possible that Dee influenced the emergence of Freemasonry in England through his association with the Family of Love. Since 1564, when Dee published the *Monas Hieroglyphica* at Antwerp, he maintained contacts with the Familist network in Europe.⁵⁵ In the 1570's his patron Queen Elizabeth tolerated Familists among her courtiers, and Dee influenced the interest of the Sidney circle in the Familists' ecumenical, mystical teachings.⁵⁶ In 1581 Elizabeth succumbed to pressure from Puritan critics of the Family of Love and issued a prohibition of their teachings, but the sect went underground and maintained links with their Continental brethren. In the 1590's, Dee frequented a bookshop in London owned by the crypto-Familist publishing house of Birckmann, and in 1604 a Flemish initiate

⁵² M. Napier, *Memoirs*, 233-42.

⁵³ Francis Yates, *The Rosicrucian Enlightenment* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972), 214-15.

⁵⁴ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 104-05.

⁵⁵ J. Van Dorsten, *Radical Arts*, 21-25.

⁵⁶ M. Srigley, "Influence," 100-05.

recorded his conversations with Dee at the shop, where the visitor tried to obtain the key to the *Monas Hieroglyphica*.

That Familists maintained ties with kindred spirits in England, Scotland, France, Flanders, and Spain meant that Plantin's vision of the Golden Compasses as a vehicle of Hermetic tolerance and fraternity continued into the Jacobean age. As Van Dorsten notes, surviving evidence on the Familists suggests "a powerful, as it were masonic, network of politicians and *virii docti*."⁵⁷ Thus, it is suggestive that the Familists expected to receive a sympathetic hearing from James, when they presented their petition "into the King's royal hands" soon after his arrival in London.⁵⁸ They perhaps assumed that James was interested in their tenets because of Plantin's earlier contacts with Buchanan and their non-sectarian sympathy towards Scottish religious refugees.

No original copy of the Familists' petition of 1604 survives, but an anonymous critic reprinted the text along with his hostile commentary in *A Supplication of the Family of Love* (1606). The Familists argued that James erred when he added them to his revised edition of *Basilikon Doron* (1603), because he classified them as Anabaptists and lumped them with Puritans.⁵⁹ Moreover, they were not political subversives nor sexual libertines but obedient citizens and pious Christians. They followed the teachings of their late spiritual leader Hendrik Niklaes (H.N.), with the result that they "neither take part with, nor write against, any particular party or company whatsoever."⁶⁰ The critic responded that the Familists are temporizers, who "are pliable to all religions, services, and times, for their own ease and advantage," and thus "shunne persecution and trouble." Through their dissembling, the Familists have grown wealthy and "over familiar with his Majestie," who should purge his court of "such well wishers and favourers of H.N."

Even worse, the critic charged, the "chiefest" among Elizabethan Familist courtiers still held an honored position. Could this have been Dee, who assumed the title of "Servant and Mathematician to his Majestie"? In their petition, the Familists offered to procure

⁵⁷ J. Van Dorsten, *Radical Arts*, 29.

⁵⁸ J. Moss, "Godded with God", 54–55.

⁵⁹ *A Supplication of the Family of Love* (Cambridge: John Legate, 1606). The STC 10683 copy includes a marginal note that the author was H. Lownes. James added a reference to the Familists in the 1603 edition of *Basilikon*, which was designed for an English audience.

⁶⁰ J. Moss, "Godded with God", 14–15, 35.

Continental publications by Niklaes and urged the king or some appointed readers to study them. They also offered to bring surviving disciples of Niklaes from Europe to England in order to counsel James. The critic claimed that the Familists abjured before the king but, according to Moss, the sect re-emerged "under the more relaxed rule of King James."⁶¹ That James would be tolerant of the Familists is not surprising, for he sympathized with many of their positions. In fact, the king probably shared the sentiment of his legal adviser Francis Bacon, who read the Familist petition and subsequently disapproved of the forced swearing by the brothers before the Court of High Commission: "He seeketh not union but division, which exacteth inwardly that which men are content to yield in outward action." Certainly, his statement echoed James's attitude towards privately held Catholic beliefs in otherwise loyal subjects.

Thus, Bacon should be considered another candidate—besides Dee—for the "chiefest" courtier who continued Familist interests from Elizabeth's into James's court. Marsh suggests that Bacon sympathized with the sect's ideas of civil obedience and religious tolerance, which he may have learned about from his father, Sir Nicholas Bacon, who had promoted the prominent Familist Robert Seale to a position of Yeoman of the Guard at Elizabeth's court.⁶² Seale continued his service under James until his death (ca. 1607), while his son Thomas and other Familists were employed by James as couriers for letters in Britain and to France. Thus, it seems that in 1604, when Dee petitioned the king and frequented a bookshop run by Familists who also petitioned the king, an intellectual climate emerged in England that was more receptive to the Pythagorean-Solomonic world view that previously flourished in James's Scottish kingdom.

In the same year, when James decided to launch an ambitious scholarly project of Bible translation, he confidently called upon Hebrew and Greek scholars who utilized works published by Plantin's crypto-Familist press. He disapproved of the sectarian commentary which filled the margins of the Calvinist Bible produced at Geneva, for he hoped the investigation of Hebrew etymologies and traditions would produce a less anachronistic and historically accurate translation. Over the next seven years, his team explored a vast variety

⁶¹ Ibid., 54–55.

⁶² Christopher Marsh, *The Family of Love in England, 1550–1630* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994), 116–17, 169, 204.

of Jewish sources, from the Talmud to Cabalistic treatises, and they had access to first-hand instruction in Hebrew from several Jews who were now permitted to work in the universities.⁶³ The king hoped to emulate the Bible Academy established by Phillip II which produced the great Plantin Polyglot, and some of his scholars hoped to refute Villalpando's Jesuit-influenced interpretations of scripture. Like them, James immersed himself in the works of Plantin, Masius, Montano, Villalpando, and other Familist-Lullist scholars.⁶⁴ When the King James "authorized" Bible was published in 1611, the preface cited Trithemius and Postel among its authorities and made clear that the project was part of the king's Solomonic agenda of reconstructing the Temple.⁶⁵

While the Bible translators labored to investigate the Hebraic and Classical roots of true religion (British-Protestant), the designers and craftsmen of the court labored to express the Jewish and Roman ideals of true architecture (Solomonic-Vitruvian). Encouraged by the patronage of king and queen, two talented artisans—Ben Jonson and Inigo Jones—developed into brilliant artists. Significantly, both were initially trained in practical crafts—Jonson as a bricklayer and Jones as a joiner—and possibly underwent apprenticeship in the building guilds. Jonson had additional experience as a soldier and developed an interest in "the configurations of warfare."⁶⁶ When he turned his hand to poetry and drama, Jonson assimilated architectural theory, structure, and terminology into his texts. Though his erudition and wit made him a popular writer, his violent behavior and conversion to Catholicism led to spells of imprisonment under Elizabeth.

Inigo Jones was born a Catholic but conformed publicly to the Anglican church; according to Christopher Wren, he would die a private Catholic.⁶⁷ His forename derived from the Spanish Yñigo, and he may have made a youthful journey to Spain.⁶⁸ In 1598 he travelled to Italy to prepare for a career as a painter, and in 1603

⁶³ Israel Baroway, "Toward Understanding Tudor-Jacobean Hebrew Studies," *Jewish Social Studies*, 18 (1956), 17–23.

⁶⁴ See John Williams, *Great Britain's Salomon* (London: John Bill, 1625), 22, 24, 29, 36.

⁶⁵ Geddes MacGregor, *A Literary History of the Bible* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1968), 222, 229–30, 234. The preface is attributed to Miles Smith.

⁶⁶ A.W. Johnson, *Jonson*, 3. The following discussion draws on Johnson's book.

⁶⁷ H. Colvin, *Biog. Dict.*, 557.

⁶⁸ Edward Chaney, *The Evolution of the Grand Tour* (London: Frank Cass, 1998), 168.

he visited Denmark, where he observed the great castle of Fredericksborg, designed by Christian IV. The Danish king made his own models for the royal buildings, which were considered among the most beautiful in Europe, and he supervised a sophisticated team of masons. Like his brother-in-law James VI and I, Christian stood on the level with his craftsmen. It was no coincidence that Jones's first royal patron was Christian's sister, Queen Anne, also a private Catholic.⁶⁹

Though Jonson early got in trouble with James because of his anti-Scottish jokes, he soon emerged as a valuable propagandist for the new regime. In 1604 Jonson began a fruitful collaboration with Jones in the production of masques to celebrate the Hermetic and Solomonic ideals of the Stuart court. Perhaps as background reading, Jonson acquired rare editions on Vitruvian architecture, Pythagorean mysticism, and a Hebrew dictionary.⁷⁰ Though there were no Scottish-style lodges in London, where secret rituals of architectural mysticism could be enacted, the king's masque-makers used suggestive Masonic themes in their quasi-public court productions. As Howarth notes, the Stuart masques were an "inventive type of temporary architecture."⁷¹ In *The Masque of Blackness*, produced in January 1605 for Queen Anne, Jonson's script invoked Pythagoras, while Jones's design displayed the figure of Pythagorean "Perfectio"—a woman holding "a Compassee of golde, drawing a circle."⁷²

The encouragement given to Jonson and Jones by the new court was part of a royal agenda to improve not only architecture and drama but all the arts and crafts. In 1605 James knighted Sir Hugh Platt (who wrote about the Art of Memory, innovations in masonry, and experiments in alchemy and chemistry). Praising his contributions to science and the public welfare, James compensated for Platt's neglect under the previous regime. Francis Bacon, who contributed to an early masque, recognized the king's predilection for reformation of the crafts. In the same year that Platt was honored, Bacon published *The Advancement of Learning*, dedicated to James, in which

⁶⁹ J. Harris, *King's Arcadia*, 16.

⁷⁰ David Mc Pherson, "Ben Jonson's Library and Marginalia," *Studies in Philology*, 71 (1974), X, 54, 73, 80, 97.

⁷¹ David Howarth, *Images of Rule: Art and Politics in the English Renaissance, 1485-1649* (London: Macmillan, 1997), 203.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 133.

he argued for a royally-subsidized program of scientific research and practical experimentation. As a youth in Paris, Bacon was exposed to the lectures of Bernard Palissy, a versatile artisan and inventor, who learned many of his craft skills “by the strict tutelage of the *Compagnonnage*.”⁷³ From his early studies in practical geometry, Palissy developed expertise in architecture, designing, painting, ceramics, chemistry, alchemy, and apothecary.⁷⁴ Though a zealous Protestant, he invited men separated by civil war to join together to develop the national economy by rational exploitation of natural resources and effective use of scientific discoveries.

In his popular lectures and publications, Palissy revealed the means of augmenting one’s material wealth while increasing one’s spiritual worth. Most relevant to Bacon’s and later James I’s ambitions were Palissy’s treatises “*Des Pierres*” and “*Des Metaux et Alchimie*,” which featured dialogues between Theory and Practice, and “*De Jardin Delectable*,” which discussed landscape architecture as a branch of “*massonerie*.” To explain the architectural nature of gardening, Palissy utilized his readings in Vitruvius and Serlio and his experiences with operative masons to give ethical and spiritual definitions to the tools of their craft (the compass, ruler, square, plumb, gauge, astrolabe).⁷⁵ His catechistical method (“*Demande, Response*”) for revealing the symbolic meaning of the practical tool apparently drew on that of the *compagnonnage*, and it bore striking resemblances to later Masonic catechisms in Britain. Palissy’s agenda was similar to John Napier’s, and while both men advocated practical experimentation, they employed alchemystical speculation in their “masonic” projects. After Francis Bacon returned from Paris, he was informed by his brother Anthony about Napier’s ambitious plans, which were supported by James VI. Significantly, the Bacons knew that both Frenchman and Scot were associated with craft fraternities, which combined practical and esoteric instruction.

In *The Advancement of Learning* (1605), Francis Bacon described James I as King Solomon, who searched out the secrets of nature, and as

⁷³ Paolo Rossi, *Francis Bacon: From Magic to Science*, trans. Sacha Rabinovitch (Chicago: Chicago UP, 1968), 8–9; Francis Delon, “Masonic Landscape Design,” *AQC*, 111 (1998), 265.

⁷⁴ Bernard Palissy, *Oeuvres de Bernard Palissy*, eds. M. Faujas de Saint Fond et M. Gobet (Paris: Ruault, 1777), xv–xxii.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 563–636.

Hermes Trismegistus, who possessed learning, illumination, and universality.⁷⁶ Though his main argument was the need to test theory by experiment, Bacon had read James's writings and was aware of his on-going investigations of the occult sciences, from which the king managed to escape "unpolluted." Bacon himself was well-versed in the literature of these sciences, which he hoped to reform for practical and civic purposes. Like Platt, he viewed the current practice of the Art of Memory as "deficient" and "ill-managed." Especially counter-productive was "the travail of Raymundus Lullius," whose art has become "nothing but a mass of words of all arts." Bacon may have learned from James about the practical training in Memory required of Scottish architects and masons. According to John Aubrey, Bacon acted as "the chieftest architect" of his house at Verulam and then added painted windows with emblematic "topiques of locall memory" to a new wing of his house at Gorhambery.⁷⁷

Aubrey further suggested that Bacon was interested in Roman theories of architecture and planned to rebuild the ancient town of Verulam according to its original Roman design: he "had a great mind to have made it a citie again: and he had designed it to be built with great uniformity." To achieve such Vitruvian ideals, Bacon recognized the importance of improved guild organization for the advancement of scientific knowledge. After expressing rather daring praise for the organization of Jesuit colleges, which provided much stimulus to learning, Bacon then proposed another model which had suggestive Familist and masonic parallels:

We see there be many orders and foundations, which though they be divided under several sovereignties and territories, yet they take themselves to have a kind of contract, fraternity, and correspondence one with the other, insomuch as they have provincials and generals. And surely as nature createth brotherhood in families, and arts mechanical contract brotherhoods in communalities, and the anointment of God superintendeth a brotherhood in kings and bishops, so in like manner there cannot but be a fraternity in learning and illumination . . .⁷⁸

⁷⁶ See Francis Bacon, *The Advancement of Learning and The New Atlantis*, ed. Arthur Johnston (Oxford: Clarendon, 1974), 5-6, 40, 69, 130, 138.

⁷⁷ John Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, ed. Andrew Clark (Oxford: Clarendon, 1898), I, 77-78, 82.

⁷⁸ F. Bacon, *Advancement*, 65-66.

Calling upon the king to subsidize this new fraternity, Bacon stressed the benefits of studying the “mysteries” of the different crafts and trades.

That Bacon, Jonson, and Jones all merged interests in royalist masques and practical crafts—which Bacon summed up in the medieval guild term “mysteries”—is relevant to the merging of architecture, scenic design, music, and poetry that became the hallmark of Stuart culture. As A.W. Johnson observes, the court masque became “a theatre of mysteries,” in which the initiated observers and participants were led to “a state of consciousness that bordered on the visionary,” all in the service of a mystical royalism.⁷⁹ That the creators and probably the king recognized the similarities of these rituals and mysteries to those of ancient masonic lodges is suggested by the parallel developments in masque and masonry, which both fell under the provenance of architecture. James, who brought his long experience with sophisticated Scottish architects and stonemasons to London, hoped to improve the training and expertise of English masons. At this time, England had no tradition of a general or national warden of the masons, and no one had played the dominating role of William Schaw.⁸⁰ Inigo Jones had no experience with building in stone, despite his familiarity with the Vitruvian and Continental literature on civic and religious architecture.

In 1606, when James decided to replace Elizabeth’s wood and canvas Banqueting House with a brick and stone structure, he was frustrated by the disorganization and incompetency of the Office of Works. Then, in January, he was favorably impressed by an architectural design presented as a New Year’s gift by Sir David Cunningham, his former Master of the Works in Scotland.⁸¹ The next month, Cunningham took the oaths to become Surveyor of Works in the London office, with the Flemish craftsman Nicholas Cure serving as his master mason.⁸² James then asked Cunningham to provide a design for the Banqueting House, and the “Lord Architect” (as he was called) utilized the idea of a Vitruvian basilica or Egyptian hall, with bays and columns of stone to be carved by Thomas Thorpe.⁸³

⁷⁹ A. Johnson, *Jonson*, 42–43.

⁸⁰ D. Knoop and R. Jones, *Mediaeval Mason*, 173.

⁸¹ H. Colvin, *History*, IV, 324.

⁸² *CSP. Domestic, James I*, VIII, 286.

⁸³ H. Colvin, *History*, IV, 323.

According to the English historian Harris, this was such "an astonishingly advanced notion for 1606" that Inigo Jones must have influenced the design.⁸⁴ However, Cunningham drew on a long tradition of Italian (and "Egyptian") influence in Scottish architecture and masonry and did not require an English mentor.

In July 1606, when the Danish king Christian IV visited London, James entertained him lavishly and proudly affirmed the Solomonic ambitions of Stuart kingship. At Theobalds he held a great feast, "and after dinner the representation of Solomon's Temple and the coming of the Queen of Sheba was made."⁸⁵ Jones was probably involved in this production, for he was Queen Anne's confidante in masque production. Skovgaard suggests that Christian—by now a sophisticated and experienced architect—discussed his building plans with his sister, who shared them with Jones and James. After Christian left, however, James's ambitious plans for the new Banqueting House were soon frustrated. The Scottish architect Cunningham was dead by 1607, and his design was not fully adopted by the London Office of Works, whose new Surveyor Simon Basil paid five more officials to make drawings for the building. The resulting edifice showed "inconsistencies in design," which suggest "the lack of a controlling architect."⁸⁶

When the king viewed the finished building in September 1607, he was so disappointed with the inept design that he expressed scorn for the "Lord Architect" (an ironic insult at the lack of such a person). Unlike Scotland, where aristocratic architects traditionally worked closely with their masons and where kings were affiliated with the craft fraternity, there was still a clear class division in England between gentlemen and artisans. Moreover, there was none of the social mobility fostered by the masonic tradition in Scotland. When the king appointed James Murray as royal Master of Works in Scotland in 1607, he did not hesitate to elevate an operative craftsman (a master wright) to a position of status and power—"our Soverane lord understanding perfytlie . . . [Murray's] skilful experience, knowledge, and

⁸⁴ J. Harris, *King's Arcadia*, 119.

⁸⁵ Joakim Skovgaard, *A King's Architecture: Christian IV and His Buildings* (London: Hugh Evelyn, 1973), 124–29.

⁸⁶ J. Newman, "Inigo Jones and the Politics of Architecture," in Peter Lake and Kevin Sharpe, eds., *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (London: Macmillan, 1994), 232; D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 61.

habilitie.”⁸⁷ The talented artisan drew on European architectural traditions, and he would later be knighted by James’s son Charles I.

It was apparently recognition of English class division and Puritan insularity (with its subsequent impoverishment of architectural expertise) that led a Scottish tutor, James Cleland, to include an important section on mathematics, architecture, and masonry in his educational treatise, *The Institution of a Young Noble Man*, published at Oxford in 1607. Cleland was descended from the Scottish hero Wallace, and his immediate ancestors had served at the court of the architecturally-gifted James V. Thus, he may have become privy to “ancient” Scottish masonic traditions.⁸⁸ As a youth in the 1590’s, he studied at Edinburgh University, when John Napier was the major influence on mathematical and mechanical instruction. Cleland then travelled in Europe, where he became an advocate of the “auld alliance” and a convinced Francophile. On his return to Scotland, he was employed by Ludovick Stuart, Second Duke of Lennox and son of James’s early favorite, Esmé Stuart of Aubigny. Soon after the king moved to London, Lennox and Cleland followed.

From 1605 to 1607 Cleland worked as a tutor to Sir John Harington, a fellow student and intimate of Prince Henry at his court of Nonestuch. Cleland greatly admired “the Academie of the Noble Prince, wher Young Nobles may learne the first elements to be a Privie Counsellor, a Generall of an Armie, to rule in peace, and to command in warre.”⁸⁹ He was also friendly with fellow Scots at the court, such as William Fowler (the king’s instructor in Memory), Robert Kerr (student of alchemy and architecture), and Adam Newton (tutor to Prince Henry and expert in mathematics and architecture). In 1606 Newton acquired land at Charlton Manor, on the outskirts of London, and began planning a “goodly brave house,” which revealed Palladian influence and became “justly famous for its innovative axially-placed halls.”⁹⁰ Newton drew on his earlier observations of French architecture and experience with Scottish masons, and the construction project was studied by his friend Cleland.

⁸⁷ D. Howard, *Scottish Architecture*, 212. In Scotland a wright was sometimes described as a mason or carver; see J. Dunbar, *Scottish Royal Palaces*, 234.

⁸⁸ James Cleland, *The Institution of a Young Noble Man*, ed. Max Molyneux (1607; facs. rpt. New York: Scholars’ Facsimiles & Reprints, 1948), ix–liii.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 35.

⁹⁰ “Adam Newton,” *DNB*; M. Airs, *Buildings*, 65; John Gurney, “Lady Jane Berkeley, Ashley House, and Architectural Innovation in late-Elizabethan England,” *AH*, 43 (2000), 113, 117.

During Cleland's two-year stint at Nonesuch, he composed *The Institution of a Young Noble Man*, which revealed to English readers many of the themes and ambitions of Scottish Freemasonry (though it is unknown if he was an actual initiate). Significantly, in light of Yates's speculation that John Dee influenced the emergence of Freemasonry in England, it was the Scottish author Cleland who first recommended the study of Dee to gentlemen architects who hoped to achieve the theoretical expertise of the master mason. In his chapter on "Teaching of the Mathematickes," Cleland affirmed that "all things had their first original being from *Numbers*" and that "Arithmetical figures were the principal patterne of Gods minde." The young student should master basic numbers, drawing them upon "some cleare polished Stone made for that purpose." Then he should progress to higher mathematics:

When he is perfect in that science, read unto him the 7.8. and 9. bookes of *Euclid's Elements*, weich containe a great secret knowledge of *Numbers*, and also will serve for an easie entrance unto *Geometry*. Wherein if yee would have your Scholler anie waies to bee conversant, read the first six bookes of *Euclid's Elements* with *Doctor Dees Mathematicall Preface*, which I esteeme verie necessary to bee knowne for the general *Proëme*: use these *Scholies* annexed by Mr. Billingsley, as also *Forcadels Commentaries*.⁹¹

Dee's Preface was particularly relevant to James's current frustration with the deficient skills of London builders, for Dee had lambasted the English for devaluing architecture as "not worthy, or not mete, to be reckned among the *Artes Mathematicall*." Because they did not read Euclid, Vitruvius, Agrippa, Durer, Cardano, or Alberti, the English did not produce "many cunning and skilful men" in the mathematical and mechanical arts. Dee argued that England did not produce true architects because "this ample Science" required vast learning and years of training:

... none can justly account themselves Architectes, of the suddeyne. But they onely, who from their childe yeares, ascending by these degrees of knowledges, beyng fostered up with the atteyning of many Languages and Artes, have wonne to the high Tabernacle of Architecture. And to whom Nature hath given such quicke Circumspection, sharpnes of witt, and Memorie, that they may be very absolutely skillfull in Geometrie, Astronomie, Musike, and the rest of the *Artes Mathematicall*:

⁹¹ J. Cleland, *Institution*, 91.

Such surmount and passe the allynge and state of Architectes: and are become Mathematiciens. And they are found seldome.⁹²

Repeating that “few (in our days) attayne” to excellence in architecture and that “scarcitie of Artificers” compounds the problem, Dee painted a highly idealized picture of the architect as “the Immaterialist” who prescribes “in mind and imagination the whole formes, all materiall stuffe beying secluded.” He seemed to have no awareness of the collaborative relationship of Scottish architects (king, bishop, noble, Master of Works, etc.) who “stood on the level” with their master masons and craftsmen. Thus, Dee would not allow a carpenter to “bee allowed an Architect,” for the hand of the carpenter was merely the architect’s instrument. As we shall see, King James would soon follow the more egalitarian Scottish tradition by encouraging a former joiner, Inigo Jones, to become a Vitruvian architect.

Addressing the kind of English reader whom Dee disparaged, Cleland urged the application of Dee’s theoretical mathematics to the practical arts of architecture and masonry:

Cause your Scholler to draw first upon the paper with his pen, coale, or chalke plainlie . . . the situation of a Towne, Citty, or any house; the course of a River, or the campe of an Army, etc. before you put him to practise by the due applying of Compasse, Rule, Square, or such like instruments, to be certified either of the length, perimetry, or distance Lineal: to judge of the height of a Towre, the depth of a ditch, or of any such thing appertaining to *military discipline*, and principles of *Architecture*: which I thinke necessarie also for a Gentleman to be knowne; not to worke as a Maister Mason, but that he may be able in looking upon any building, both naturallie in respect of itself, and in respect of the eie, to tel what is *Frontispiece*, *Tympane*, *Cornishes*, *Pedestals*, *Frizes*, what is the *Tuscane*, *Dorik*, *Ionick*, *Corinthian*, and *composed orders*, like a *Surveyor*.⁹³

While Cleland was still at Henry’s court in 1609, the prince received the great library of the recently deceased Henry Lumley, who had been a friend of James and Henry. Among the books were Dee’s works on cosmography, navigation, and mathematics (including the *Monas Hieroglyphica*).⁹⁴

⁹² J. Dee, “Preface to *Euclid*.”

⁹³ J. Cleland, *Institution*, 91–92.

⁹⁴ Sears Jayne and Francis Johnson, eds., *The Lumley Library: The Catalogue of 1609*

Cleland was not the only Scottish courtier interested in Dee's mathematical works, for Robert Kerr acquired the Dee-Euclid volume, while he also collected architectural treatises.⁹⁵ John Marr, the king's Scottish mathematician and close friend of John Napier, was interested in the mathematical and magical writings of Dee. When he learned of Dee's death in February 1609, Marr immediately went to Mortlake to examine the papers of the *magus*.⁹⁶ His study of the diary records of angelic conversations convinced Marr that they contained an ingenious diplomatic code—a conclusion that would later be reinforced by the great scientist Robert Hooke.⁹⁷ If Cleland was aware of Dee's Cabalistic studies, he would probably have considered them legitimate offshoots of mathematics, for he himself drew on "the CABALIST Rabbins" and Reuchlin's *de Cabal* in his later writings.⁹⁸ However, Cleland did not include them for the young student. Dee advised a graduated "ascendyng by these degrees of knowledges," while Scottish Freemasons utilized degrees of initiation, including Cabalistic lore, to reach Dee's "high Tabernacle of Architecture."

Throughout *The Institution*, Cleland revealed his familiarity with the writings of Hermes Trismegistus, Pythagoras, Philo, Sacrobosco, Pico, Bodin, Cardano, and with the general neo-Platonic and hieroglyphic theories of the Renaissance. He urged that all theories be evaluated in terms of their practical usefulness. Rather than cramming children's heads with memorized facts—"or in appointing *places* and *pictures* into *Julius Camillus* his Theater"—a tutor should "begin at principles, and passe through the middle sciences by little and little to attaine at last the degree of a Doctor."⁹⁹ Cleland's rejection of Giulio Camillo's *Idea del Teatro* (1550) paralleled the Scottish Masons' stress on the architectural visualization rather than linguistic rationalization of the mnemonic arts. As a "devout Ciceronian," Camillo viewed the design and structure of his Memory Theater as "essentially

(London: British Museum, 1956), 211, 223. Vaughan Hart claims that Henry also owned Dee's edition of Euclid, but it is not listed in the catalogue; see *Art and Magic*, 129.

⁹⁵ Kerr's library.

⁹⁶ R. Deacon, *Dee*, 224–25; for the corrected death date, see Dee, *Diaries*, 304.

⁹⁷ Robert Hooke, *The Posthumous Works of Robert Hooke* (London, 1703), 203–10.

⁹⁸ James Cleland, *A Monument of Mortality Upon the Death of Lodovick, Duke of Richmond* (London: William Stansby, 1624), 20; and *Jacob's Well and Abbot's Conduit Paralleled* (London: Robert Allot, 1626), 31.

⁹⁹ J. Cleland, *Institution*, 70–71.

linguistic, rhetorical in the technical sense.”¹⁰⁰ Unlike Lull’s *Art*, his had little practical value for the technological education of the child—much less the artisan or mason.

Thus, Cleland argued that a child should not be expected to imitate “*Bodins* subtile and curious search after *Vitruvius*.” Rather, “the Tutor must see him bring al his speculation to practise, or else think with me that he can doe nothing”:

For what wil it serve to have his boord or paper ful of numbers, and yet cannot lay an account of 40. shillings? To heare him say that hee will measure the height of *Paules Steeple*, when hee commeth to short or too longe in the shaft of a brome? What pleasure is it to heare him talke of fortification; and then to see small essayes only upon the paper with rule and compass? . . . Surelie I think hee had better imploied his time and mony in the *Tennis Court*. I account so little of al this booke learning, which cannot be put in use.¹⁰¹

Cleland’s model throughout was the Pythagorean system of gradual initiation with its required secrecy and fraternity. The perfect product of this educational method was King James, who embodied the “Quintessence” of wisdom:

. . . such wits, as appeare not to bee taught or informed by men, but infused by God; they are able in the twinkling of an eie, at the first motion to conceive, invent, and retaine al things most accurately. Of such wits I have never read, seene, or heard of one comparable to the Kings Maiesty, who by the fineness of his understanding moveth the learnedest men both to thinke and write with *Plato*, that all our knowledge is but *Remembrance*. He standeth invested with that triplicite, which in great veneration was ascribed to ancient *Hermes*, the power and fortune of a King, the knowledge and illumination of a Priest, and the Learning and universalitie of a Philosopher.¹⁰²

In a marginal note to this passage, Cleland cited Bacon’s *Advancement of Learning* as his source, and it is clear that he saw a combination of Dee’s mathematics with Bacon’s methods as a key to educational improvement.

¹⁰⁰ Maurice Slawinski, “Rhetoric and Science/Rhetoric of Science/Rhetoric as Science,” in Stephen Pumfrey, Paolo Rossi, and Maurice Slawinski, eds., *Science, Culture and Popular Belief in Renaissance Europe* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1991), 85–87.

¹⁰¹ J. Cleland, *Institution*, 94.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 54.

However, even more important was the elimination of false snobbery, for true nobility was not inherited but earned by merit. Thus, the young aristocrat should exercise "an honest curiositie" and become "familiar sometimes with the meanest trades-men," learning from them their particular expertise.¹⁰³ Raised in Scottish traditions of informal and affable relations between gentlemen and artisans, Cleland worried about the influence of English class consciousness and arrogant manners on young Scottish courtiers in London—"because I see so many of our young nobles deceive themselves" that "they are not tied to any reciprocal courtesey."¹⁰⁴ When the young noble travels abroad, he should employ his mathematical training in observing and recording the varieties of architecture, both civil and military. While avoiding the snares of Papist seduction through the magnificence of Catholic art and architecture, the traveller should recognize with Hermes Trismegistus the universality of the religious impulse. Like Socrates, he should aspire to be a citizen of the world. Though all men are born and die alike, "as the Jew said," the young student can pass through the "Temple of Virtue" to earn true nobility. Cleland's treatise, with its Scottish "Masonic" message, was evidently popular. He reprinted it in 1611 under the title of *The Scottish Academie* and in 1612 with a dedication to Prince Charles.

Cleland attended James's court, and his book would surely have appealed to the king. The year of its publication was one of frustration and new direction in royal architectural projects. In 1607, while James criticized the muddled design of the Banqueting House, he also ordered Bacon as king's solicitor to deal with infringements of the building codes.¹⁰⁵ Under Simon Basil, who served as Surveyor until 1615, the Office of Works became a "power house of patronage" and spent enormous sums.¹⁰⁶ However, Basil was no Schaw, and he proved incapable of realizing James's ambitious architectural agenda. Unlike Schaw, Basil did not implement any plan for improving the education and expertise of native masons. During Elizabeth's reign, there had been little carved work, whether in stone or wood.¹⁰⁷ In 1605, when James planned a series of royal tombs in Westminster

¹⁰³ For the following quotes, see *ibid.*, 2, 5, 57–59, 101, 258–59.

¹⁰⁴ See D. Stevenson, "English Devil," 130.

¹⁰⁵ N. Brett-Jones, *Growth*, 83.

¹⁰⁶ J. Harris, *King's Arcadia*, 112.

¹⁰⁷ H. Colvin, *History*, III, 129; IV, 36;

Abbey, he first turned to a French sculptor, who also completed a carved stone monument to Queen Elizabeth in 1607. In that year, James employed the Flemish master mason Cure to carve a monument to his late mother.

The king's determination to improve the skills of London masons and to utilize foreign masons to instruct them provoked an odd warning from Edward Topsell, a royalist who sensed the hostility of Puritan factions and craftsmen to James's masonic agenda. In *The History of Serpents*, composed in 1607 and published the next year, Topsell stressed the similarities between the social, political, and architectural society of bees and that of Britain. Noting that "some Bees are descended of the kingly race and borne of the bloud Royall," he praised James's pacific policies by bee analogies:

The King . . . excelleth in mildnesse and temperatenesse of behaviour. For he hath a sting, but maketh it not an instrument of revenge . . . And although [king bees] seeme to be slacke in revenging and punishing private injuries, yet for all that they never suffer rebellious persons, refratorious, obstinate, and such as will not be ruled, to escape without punishment . . . They are so studious of peace, that neither willingly nor unwillingly they will give any cause of offence or displeasure.¹⁰⁸

A threat to royal policies of peace comes from swarming subjects, who become "divided and distracted into many mindes . . . banding into parties."

Praising the king bee for directing the ambitious design and construction of his Pythagorean hive-palace, Topsell portrayed the drone-builders as "Maister Worke-men, free Masons, and Carpenters" who serve the aristocratic bees:

. . . these Drones . . . imploy themselves about the building of the Kings House, which they make large, stately, and very sumptuous . . . if you looke toward their Art or science of building, they are accounted as excellent devisers of the frame and chiefe Maisters of the whole worke . . . the Drones are the sole inventors, and principall work-maisters of the Kings Court . . . In summe except they [Drones] should stand the Bees in good stead, the Almighty would never have enclosed them both in one house, and as it were made them freemen of the same Citty . . .

¹⁰⁸ Edward Topsell, *The History of Serpents* (London: William Jaggard, 1608), 65–67.

However, though bees will "undergoe the rule of their over-seers and Surveiors," they "will by no means endure . . . the hand and discipline of a stranger," nor should they value the drones ("Maister-workmen, free Masons, and Carpenters") above "the true labouring Husbandman, and tiller of the Earth." With this cautious advice, Topsell introduced a motif of bees as emblematic of Stuart Freemasonry that would be repeated over the next decades.¹⁰⁹ When Swift affirmed in 1724 that "A Bee has in all Ages and Nations been the Grand Hieroglyphick of Masonry" and connected it with Franco-Scottish traditions of royalty, he drew on a theme first published in England in 1608.¹¹⁰ Topsell dedicated his work to Richard Neile, dean of Westminster, who became an activist rebuilder of churches and who later accompanied James to Scotland (a journey with Masonic significance).

Perhaps cautioned by Topsell and Neile, James undertook a constructive policy to remedy the deficiencies in architectural expertise and the shortages of skilled masons in London. He hoped to reform English masonry by turning Inigo Jones into his William Schaw. Though Anderson stated that Jones served as Grand Master in 1607 and performed a masonic ceremony while levelling "the Footstone of the new Banquetting-House," it is unlikely that he had taken on such an early leadership role.¹¹¹ For his controversial claim, Anderson cited a manuscript written by Nicholas Stone, who later served as master mason to Jones (the document was allegedly burned in 1720). However, there is evidence that by 1608 the king decided to employ Jones on important architectural and masonic projects.

When James ordered a survey of the needed repairs for St. Paul's cathedral, Jones provided him with drawings. The English chancellor Salisbury also solicited designs from Jones for the New Exchange on the Strand. Colvin notes that these drawings reveal "an imperfect assimilation of classical themes from such sources as Serlio, Palladio, and Sangallo, and of a total lack of practical experience."¹¹² Summerson goes further to argue that the drawings were "obviously

¹⁰⁹ When Topsell's work was republished during the Cromwellian Interregnum, the reference to "free Masons" was omitted; see *The History of Four-footed Beasts, Serpents, and Insects*, rev. ed. (London: E. Cotes, 1658), 920.

¹¹⁰ Swift, *Prose*, V, 327.

¹¹¹ J. Anderson, *Constitutions (1738)*, 98-99.

¹¹² H. Colvin, *Biog. Dict.*, 555.

the work of somebody who had little to do with architecture and nothing with building.” Probably hoping to improve Jones’s skills, the king sent him to France in summer 1609, when he may have also visited Italy. When Jones returned, he showed striking improvement in his skill at Italianate drawing. The king now implemented his plan of raising the standards of craftsmanship and appointed England’s first master bricklayer, who would collaborate with the master masons. By May 1610, when Jones was appointed Surveyor of Works to Prince Henry’s new court at St. James, it was clear that “a royal building mania had set in which could not now be arrested.”¹¹³

Complementing this mania was the production of new masques to celebrate the coming investment of Henry as Prince of Wales. As noted earlier, the prince had been trained since his childhood in Scotland to master the arts of military masonry—mathematics, fortifications, artillery, surveying, cosmography, etc. Since his arrival in London, he had been adopted by the old Elizabethan war party, who intensified his Puritan and anti-Catholic attitudes. Disgusted by James’s rapprochement with Spain, they fostered a myth of Henry as conquering Protestant hero who would roll back the Catholic tide in Europe. In 1607, after the thirteen year-old prince had the temerity to secretly send a military engineer as a spy to investigate French fortifications at Calais, the exposure of Henry’s “plot” caused potentially serious problems for James.¹¹⁴ When the king tried to render his son incapable of further actions that could endanger the peace, he was criticized as petty and jealous by Henry’s supporters. By 1609, however, some of Henry’s own courtiers shared the concerns of James and the moderates and Catholics at Whitehall.

The poet George Chapman, though employed by Henry, heard enough of his patron’s boasting of an “ultimate conquest of Europe.”¹¹⁵ In *Euthymiae Raptus: or the Teares of Peace* (1609), Chapman praised for the prince’s benefit the heroic efforts of James to stretch “a universal peace across Europe.” Chapman’s effort to soften the militant attitudes of the prince and his Puritan supporters sheds light on the similar effort of Jonson and Jones, Chapman’s friends, when they

¹¹³ H. Colvin, *History*, IV, 109.

¹¹⁴ J.W. Williamson, *The Myth of the Conqueror: Prince Henry Stuart* (New York: AMS Press, 1987), 43.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 85–86.

created a masque for the prince's "Barriers," a martial tournament of knightly games. In the process of transforming the image of chivalry from the arts of war to arts of peace, James's masque-makers foreshadowed the assimilation of chivalric rituals into Masonic degrees that emerged in *Écossais* Freemasonry.¹¹⁶

Though Jonson had expressed contempt for the Arthurian romances, he acquiesced to Henry's request that he utilize the old English tradition of Trojan Brutus and Merlin—a tradition that had long been employed in English imperialistic propaganda, especially against Scotland.¹¹⁷ The prince called himself "Meliadus Lord of the Isles," while he affected trappings of mythic knighthood. In Jonson's "Speeches at Prince Henry's Barriers," the poet took "the slightly daring course of symbolizing *defense* when officially *offense* was the occasion of celebration."¹¹⁸ He also presented "a personation which emphasized domestic fertility above military exploit." While Jonson's Merlin lectured the prince against the folly of war and in favor of the fruits of peace, Jones provided an architectural setting that held Henry in a firmly limited place.

In *The Barriers* Jones and Jonson wove together themes expressing the revival of chivalrous values and classical architecture. To portray the "Decayed House of Chivalry," Jones designed a fantastic Gothic setting, which also represented a new form of pacific knightly *virtù*. As J.W. Williamson points out,

Framed by Inigo Jones's architectural design, Prince Henry was made part of a visual symbol which would be repeated in Merlin's lecture: the Prince was the informing life-force *within* the designer's scenery which made St. George's portico arise out of the "ruins of Chivalry," just as the prince was the fount which fed the springs of his nation. His function as fertility force only worked when he found his proper "frame" and remained within it. To fly out to prosecute foreign wars would mean the collapse of the design . . .¹¹⁹

¹¹⁶ On the overlap between chivalric, architectural, and masonic symbolism in Stuart culture, see Vaughan Hart, "'A Piece rather of good Heraldry, than of Architecture': Heraldry and the Orders of Architecture as Joint Emblems of Chivalry," *Res*, 23 (1993), 53–61.

¹¹⁷ Norman Council, "Ben Jonson, Inigo Jones, and the Transformation of Tudor Chivalry," *ELH*, 47 (1980), 259–75.

¹¹⁸ J.W. Williamson, *Myth*, 90–91.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 93.

The king and queen must have been pleased at this poetic-architectural message to their militaristic son.

In 1610 Prince Henry received a Scottish lesson in filial obedience and Solomonic pacifism, when George Marcelline dedicated to him *The Triumphs of King James the First*. Stressing that “my tongue is Scottish,” Marcelline made a second dedication to “France, Mother of curtesie, and our ancient friend.” Targeting the English Puritans who influenced Henry, Marcelline reminded the prince that many held happy memories of his grandmother, Mary Queen of Scots, and that his great grandfather, James V, bore the title “Defender of the Faith” long before Henry VIII did, despite the deceiving claims of English “boasters.”¹²⁰ Then, to impress upon the recalcitrant prince the dominance of his father, “this Great Solomon upon his throne,” Marcelline used a plethora of mathematical and Cabalistic arguments to portray the Jamesian “Great Britain” as the successor to “the Kingdome of Juda.”

Interpreting the peaceful unification of Scotland and England in terms of musical harmony, he noted that the Cabalists affirm that the fall led to the loss of musical harmony or wisdom which was in primordial man. By manipulating various Hebrew letters and numbers, Marcelline portrayed James as the Cabalistic and Pythagorean restorer of unity:

And comming to Divination, by the numbers appropriated to their Characters, excogitated first of all by Pythagoras, the Traditions whereof are no other thing, but a very Hebrew *Cabala*, grounded upon this place in the Booke of Wisdome: God hath made all things in number, weight, and measure.

... As the hundred seaventh King of Scotland, he hath contributed more alone by himself, to *build a Temple of God*, and to reforme the service therein, then all the Kinges together have done ...¹²¹

With Henry’s library now replete with Cabalistic works by Lull, Trithemius, Cardano, Abravanel, Postel, Montano, as well as architectural works by Vitruvius, Alberti, and Giorgio, his Scottish tutors had fertile resources, while they sought to influence the prince’s acquiescence in his father’s Solomonic agenda.¹²²

¹²⁰ George Marcelline, *The Triumphs of King James the First* (London: John Budge, 1610), 48, 91.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 55, 58.

¹²² S. Jayne and R. Johnson, *Lumley Library*, passim.

Queen Anne reinforced this paternalistic tutelage when she asked Inigo Jones to design an investiture masque, *Tethys' Festivall*, which included "the Ceremonies of the Knights of the Bath." Inspired by the positive response to the design of Prince Henry's *Barriers*, Jones created an elaborate architectural display for the new masque. Collaborating with Jones was the poet Samuel Daniel, who was familiar with the defense of architecture and Art of Memory presented by Bruno, whose lectures at Oxford he earlier attended.¹²³ Daniel had observed Vitruvian architecture while travelling in Italy, possibly in the company of the Scottish courtier Robert Kerr, who became his close friend.¹²⁴

Though Daniel justified the masque form for its connection with affairs of state (an "Hieroglyphick of Empire and Dominion"), he believed that the poetry was subordinate to the architecture:

But in these things wherein the only life consists in shew; the arte and invention of the Architect gives the greatest grace, and is of most importance: ours, the least part and of the least note in the time of the performance thereof; and therefore have I inserted the description of the artificiall part, which only speakes M. Inago Jones.¹²⁵

Daniel then gave a detailed description of the fantastic mechanical devices and settings of "moderne architecture," with emblematic pillars and friezes. However, his subordination of poetry angered Ben Jonson, Jones's usual collaborator, who would nurse a growing grudge against the Vitruvian claims of the architect.

Jones's contribution to the pacification of Prince Henry through the symbolic architecture of the masques probably influenced the king to appoint him Surveyor of the Works to the prince in 1610. However, when Henry commissioned Jones and Jonson to devise a masque entitled *Oberon, the Faery Prince* (1611), he expected them to emulate Spenser's glorification of Elizabeth and the Tudors in *The Faerie Queene*. The masque-makers were probably aware of James's dislike of Spenser's poem, which included a passage deemed insulting to Mary Queen of Scots. Loyal to James's pacific vision, they took ironic advantage of their commission to further "minimize the martial capacities of the Prince" in a design and text that "unites

¹²³ Joan Rees, *Samuel Daniel* (Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 1964), 3-5.

¹²⁴ R. Kerr, *Correspondence*, I, ix. 24.

¹²⁵ J. Reese, *Daniel*, 92-93.

the traditions of chivalry with classical order.”¹²⁶ Jones’s divergence from Henry’s desires apparently alienated the prince, who did not give him any commissions as Surveyor of Works. Colvin points out that “the prince’s patronage was conspicuously extended to two foreigners”—Salomon de Caus, a French mechanician and garden designer, and Constantino de Servi, a Florentine painter and architect.¹²⁷ Moreover, there is some evidence that “the mysterious Constantino,” with Henry’s connivance, hoped to displace Jones from his position as Surveyor.¹²⁸

The king’s determination to transform the militaristic values of chivalry took place in the context of his plans to revitalize the Order of the Garter. James, and later his son Charles, wanted to revive the older religious aspects of the order. During the reign of Henry VIII, the more radical Reformers persuaded him to reject much of the ancient religious ceremonial of the order. When Elizabeth assumed the throne, she disapproved of various Protestant changes in the forms of church worship, especially the removal of decorations and sacerdotal vestments and the abridgement of outward ceremonies. Early in her reign, she similarly disapproved of the diminishment of ceremony and regalia in the Garter, but eventually she allowed the elimination of several religious rituals.¹²⁹ In 1590 Elizabeth had named James to the Garter as a wedding present, but he did not participate in installation ceremonies. Thus, he was pleased to preside over the lavish induction of the ten year-old Henry and his Scottish tutor, the Second Earl of Mar, in July 1603. James viewed the Garter as a means of integrating Scots and English into a loyalist brotherhood, and he paired Scots with English knights at the installations.¹³⁰ He gradually revived some of the older customs, such as the procession of attendants before new knights which swelled the train and increased the pageantry of the installations in 1606.

Like his grandmother and mother, who maintained close relations with the Knights Hospitallers in France and Scotland, James was well-read in the histories and romances of chivalry. According to

¹²⁶ Stephen Orgel, *The Illusion of Power* (Berkeley: California UP, 1975), 66–70.

¹²⁷ H. Colvin, *History*, III, 124–25.

¹²⁸ J. Harris, *King’s Arcadia*, 43.

¹²⁹ George Beltz, *Memorials of the Most Noble Order of the Garter* (1841; facs. rpt. New York: AMS, 1972), ciii.

¹³⁰ Neil Cuddy, “Anglo-Scottish Union and the Court of James I, 1603–25,” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th s., 39 (1989), 122.

Ben Jonson, the king's favorite book was Edward Fairfax's translation of Tasso's *Gerusalemme Liberata*, published in 1600 as *Godfrey of Bulloigne, or the Recoverie of Jerusalem*.¹³¹ James saw resemblances between his own poem *Lepanto* and Tasso's *Godfrey*, with its praise of a unified Christianity which fought successfully against the Saracens. But he was even more impressed by Fairfax's allegorical interpretation of Tasso's text, in which the Anglican translator created a kind of spiritual knighthood to transcend the martial knighthood of the Italian original. In Fairfax's preface, he sketched out a vision of universalist chivalry and philosophical kingship that appealed greatly to James:

... the Allegorie of an Heroicall Poeme is none other than the glasse and figure of human life . . . Allegorie respecteth the passions, the opinions and customes, not onely as they doe appeare, but principally in their being hidden & inward; and more obscurely doth expresse them with notes (as a man may say) mysticall, such as only the understanders of the nature of things can fully comprehend . . .

The Army compounded of divers Princes, and other Christian souldiers, signifieth man, compounded of soule and bodie . . . Jerusalem the strong citie placed in a rough and hilly countrey, whereunto as to last ende, are directed all the enterprises of the faithfull armie, doth here signifie the Civill happiness . . . Godfrey, which of all the assembly is chosen Chieftaine, stands for Understanding . . .¹³²

James obviously identified with Godfrey, who had to struggle against the machinations of witches and evil spirits to sustain his crusade. As the embodiment of "Understanding," James-Godfrey must control the other passions, which can divide the Christian forces and prevent the recovery of the earthly and spiritual Jerusalem.

Though Tasso did not include as much masonic detail as Du Bartas used, he did give an interesting description of the key role that William of Genoa, "a cunning architect," played in designing and constructing siege instruments and a fortress for the Christian forces:

... now the forts and towres (from whence they fought)
Were framed by a cunning architect . . .
In skill, in wit, in cunning him surpast

¹³¹ R.F. Patterson, ed., *Ben Jonson's Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden* (New York: Haskell House, 1974), 4.

¹³² Torquato Tasso, *Godfrey of Bulloigne*, trans. Edward Fairfax; ed. Kathleen Lea and T.M. Gang (Oxford: Clarendon, 1981), 89-90.

Yet never enginer beneath the sunne,
 Of Carpenters an hundreth large he brought
 That what their Lord devised made and wrought.
 This man begunne with woondrous arte to make
 Not rammes, not mightie brakes, not slings alone . . .
 But fram'd a fortesse huge, to which was none
 Yet ever like . . .
 They prais'd the workmen, and their skill unknowne . . .¹³³

James and the Scottish Freemasons, with their ancient Hebraic-Egyptian traditions, must have been particularly impressed that the efforts of the architect and his military masons and carpenters were reinforced by a promise of assistance to Godfrey, called "Judaies king," from "the Egyptian chiefetaine."

Tasso made clear that Scottish, Irish, and English knights joined their European and Scandinavian brothers in the universalist struggle. When Godfrey finally liberated Jerusalem, his men went to the Temple, "Which burnt and builded oft, still keeps the name/ Of the first founder, wise king *Salomone*,/ That Prince this stately house did whilome frame."¹³⁴ Rather than boasting of his military victory, Godfrey went "To the high Temple," where he "hung up his armes, and there he bowes/ His knees, there prai'd, and there perform'd his vows." When James and Prince Charles ordered the reprinting of Fairfax's *Godfrey* in 1624, the new editor John Bill affirmed that the Stuart monarchs descended from Robert of Normandie, a great crusader, and traced the heroic history of the Knights of the Hospital and Knights of Rhodes to their current diminished and vulnerable position.

Soon after the lesson in reformed chivalry presented at Prince Henry's "Barriers," James received a request to prevent the deterioration of another ancient chivalric order, the Scots Guard in France. In 1610 Marcelline had reminded Henry of the relationship of the Stuarts of Aubigny with the bodyguard of the French king.¹³⁵ Many English Puritans disapproved of this Scottish-French tradition, which had weakened during Elizabeth's reign. In 1611-12, when Marie de Medici served as regent of France after the assassination of her husband Henri IV, the Scottish archers in the French royal bodyguard

¹³³ Ibid., 502-03.

¹³⁴ Ibid., 527, 589-94.

¹³⁵ G. Marcelline, *Triumphs*, 70.

were so distressed at "numerous innovations upon the privileges of their body, and frequent causes of irritation," that they appealed to James to mediate their cause at the French court.¹³⁶ In "Le Factum pour la Compagnie des Gardes Escossoises" (1612), the king's Scottish delegates traced the guard back to Charlemagne's time, when four thousand Scots served in his wars against the Saracens, and to Malcolm III's reign, when two thousand Scots served under Godfrey of Bouillon on his voyage to Jerusalem. As he reviewed the "Factum," James probably consulted Alexander Seton, who visited London at this time, for he had participated with his father and Schaw in the 1584 effort to regain Scottish privileges, and several Setons currently served in the Guard.

In 1605 James had rewarded Seton by making him First Earl of Dunfermline, and he now named him chancellor in Scotland and custodian of Holyrood Palace. As an architecturally-gifted nobleman, Dunfermline had infused his own chivalric ideals into the design of Pinkie House (ca. 1607–22), whose castellated forms expressed feudal power, chivalric honour and knightly virtue. Like the king, however, Seton believed in a pacified chivalry, and he boasted that Pinkie's architecture "needed no fortifications." In an inscription placed on the garden wall, Seton affirmed:

D.O.M. For himself, for his descendants, for all civilized men, Alexander Seton, lover of mankind and civilization, founded, built and adorned his villa and gardens and these out-of-town buildings. Here is nothing warlike, even for defence; no ditch, no rampart. But for the kind welcome and hospitable entertainment of guests a fountain of pure water, lawns, ponds and aviaries.¹³⁷

Howard points out that Dunfermline's chivalric-architectural vision paralleled that of Jones and Jonson in the masques of pacified chivalry that were presented for the instruction of Prince Henry. Moreover, Dunfermline's cosmopolitan chivalry drew on traditions of the Scots Guard and the "auld alliance" between Scotland and France.

The later *Écossais* tradition that an Order of the Temple met in Holyrood Palace—and that Prince Charles Edward Stuart became its Grand Master in 1745—was perhaps rooted in Seton's tenure.¹³⁸

¹³⁶ *Papers Relative to the Royal Guard of Scottish Archers in France* (Edinburgh: Maitland Club, 1835), preface, 1.

¹³⁷ Deborah Howard, *Scottish Architecture*, 50–51.

¹³⁸ J.E.S. Tuckett, "Dr. Begemann and the Alleged Templar Chapter at Edinburgh

If the Scots Guard maintained secretive, neo-Templar rituals, they would become vulnerable to suspicion as more Frenchmen became members, for the Gallican church maintained the position that the Templars were anti-papal heretics. James's subsequent efforts on behalf of the Guard would provoke much criticism from Puritans, and he would later defend his actions in Parliament.¹³⁹ Thus, it may be relevant that his Master of Revels, Sir George Buc, undertook a rehabilitation of the Templars, in the process of researching the history of the Inns of Court.

After investigating documents on the builders of the Middle Temple, the residence of the medieval Templars, Buc concluded that they were "brave religious knights," who were unjustly persecuted by a greedy king and Pope.¹⁴⁰ As noted in Chapter One, Buc stressed the Templars' devotion to the Temple of Jerusalem, which led them to design their church in London to look like a Jewish temple or synagogue. He then traced the survival of Templar traditions in the Knights Hospitaller and Knights of Malta, "where they live at this day." Buc's praise of the Templars as builders came in the wake of the English translation of Bodin's *Six Bookes of a Commonweale* (1606), which linked the Templars with the persecuted Jews and fraternities of illuminated artificers. The Scottish courtier Robert Kerr added Bodin's work to his valuable collection of treatises on architecture and the chivalric orders.¹⁴¹

Given this background of James's and Kerr's interest in ancient and contemporary chivalric orders, the argument of Yates that Prince Henry and his party initiated a Puritan chivalric revival associated with emerging Rosicrucianism and Freemasonry must be re-examined. Her pioneering study of the Rosicrucian Enlightenment centers on the betrothal of James's daughter Elizabeth to a German Calvinist prince, the Elector Frederick of the Palatinate. As part of his policy of achieving religious peace in Europe, James planned to

in 1745," *AQC*, 33 (1920), 40–62; M.K. Schuchard, "The Young Pretender and Jacobite Freemasonry: New Light from Sweden on His Role as 'Hidden Grand Master,'" in Donald Howard, ed., *The Consortium on Revolutionary Europe* (Gainesville: Florida State UP, 1994), 363–72.

¹³⁹ James VI and I, *Political Works*, 303–04.

¹⁴⁰ Buc's treatise was composed some years before it was published in Hawes' *Annales* (1615), 1069–70.

¹⁴¹ Kerr's library catalogue is in the National Library of Scotland, MS.5818: "Catalogue of the Family Library at Newbattle." Cited henceforth as "Kerr's library."

balance this Protestant match by the betrothal of Henry to a Catholic bride. Though Henry publicly acquiesced in his father's marital project, he secretly planned to leave England with Elizabeth and her new husband and then search for a Protestant wife in Europe. According to Francis Osborne, a partisan of the prince and later Cromwellian propagandist, it was Henry who master-minded Elizabeth's fateful marriage:

Prince Henry gave the first encouragement to the Prince Elector to attempt his sister, desiring more to head an army in Germany than he durst make show of, and would no doubt have been bravely followed. That his thoughts flew high, hundreds of his servants are yet in being to witnesse, together with the love he seemed to beare his sister before his brother [Charles]; whom he would often taunt till he made him weep, telling him he should be a bishop, a gowne being fittest to hide his leggs, subject in his childhood to be crooked.¹⁴²

This militant, bullying image of a prince revered as "England's Darling" suggests that there were good grounds for the king's worry about his eldest son and his Puritan supporters.

When the Elector Frederick arrived in London in October 1612, the anti-Catholic party around Henry launched a propaganda blitz about the coming Protestant millennium. But Henry unexpectedly died in November, probably from typhoid, and his partisans spread rumors that James had him poisoned. In a subdued spirit, the preliminary festivities for the royal wedding were carried on. Frederick was elected to the Order of the Garter on 7 December, with his investiture taking place on 7 February 1613. Though Yates places great Elizabethan and "Henrician" significance on this event, the surviving evidence shows nothing out of the ordinary in the ceremonial, which was carried out in James's presence.¹⁴³

Yates also argues that the contributions of Bacon and Jones to the masque entertainments suggest their support for the militant Protestant plans of Henry and Frederick, whereas both courtiers approved of the king's policy of peace and religious conciliation. Though a nuptial masque may indeed have been added for Shakespeare's production of *The Tempest* before the young couple, there is no reason to believe that Shakespeare, a loyal member of The King's

¹⁴² W. Scott, *Secret History*, I, 287.

¹⁴³ F. Yates, *Rosicrucian*, 3-4.

Players, intended to portray John Dee in the figure of Prospero, the benevolent royal magician (as Yates suggests). Mebane argues instead that Prospero was modelled on King James, whom Bacon called an “unpolluted” scholar of magic and who enjoyed an earlier performance of the play in November 1611.¹⁴⁴

The aim of Yates is to show that Elizabeth’s Protestant marriage, Frederick’s election to the Garter, and Dee’s Cabalistic and Vitruvian interests not only stimulated the Rosicrucian movement in Germany but fostered the emergence of Freemasonry in England. Despite the great value and fruitfulness of Yates’s work, her bias against James and failure to consider the Scottish element in these developments means that her provocative study of the Rosicrucian Enlightenment is misleading in terms of Masonic history. Thus, when Elizabeth and Frederick sailed up the Rhine to Heidelberg in June 1613, they entered an environment fraught with Protestant militancy and millenarianism, but it was one unconnected, at this point, with Freemasonry in England. The architecturally-gifted and privately Catholic Earl of Arundel travelled with Elizabeth to her new home, but the tradition that Inigo Jones accompanied them is open to question. Yates acknowledges that Jones may have joined Arundel after the earl returned from Heidelberg to England, when they set off together for Italy.¹⁴⁵ There they enthusiastically studied the Vitruvian and Palladian architecture of the Catholic Renaissance—not the iconoclasm of militant German Calvinism.

However, there may have been a link between early Rosicrucian interests in Germany and similar developments in Scotland. During the early 1600’s, when the Cabalistic revelations of Simon Studion’s *Naometria* and John Dee’s *Monas Hieroglyphica* were circulating clandestinely among German alchemists, there were kindred souls in Scotland and in the enclaves of Scottish expatriates in Europe. Moreover, in these Scottish occultist circles we will find the earliest links between Rosicrucianism and Freemasonry. The links would develop and expand during the troubled reigns of James’s son and grandson, until the merged fraternities became an underground support system for the embattled Stuart dynasty.

¹⁴⁴ John Mebane, *Renaissance Magic and the Return of the Golden Age* (Lincoln: Nebraska UP, 1989), 108.

¹⁴⁵ F. Yates, *Rosicrucian*, 8.

Unlike Elizabethan England, which remained relatively isolated from cultural developments in Catholic Europe, Jacobean Scotland welcomed contacts with scholars and scientists in France, Italy, and Spain—countries with long traditions of support for Scottish monarchs, especially in their struggles against England. Moreover, James's greater tolerance for Catholics meant that his northern court received news of research and publication carried out by Scottish Catholics abroad. When James moved to London, this international Scottish network began to exert a greater influence on Hermetic and Cabalistic affairs in England.

In 1603 the most famous of the travelling Scottish adepts was Alexander Seton, "the Cosmopolite," a kinsman of James's trusted chancellor, the architect and mathematician of the same name.¹⁴⁶ The alchemist Seton had developed his method by studying the "profound Ramon Lull," which suggests an interest in the pseudo-Lullian Hermetic literature as well as the Lullist Art of Memory in the Scotland of James VI.¹⁴⁷ While travelling on the Continent, Seton astounded audiences with his transmutations which reportedly turned lead into gold. As his assistant, he employed a fellow Scot, William Hamilton, whose red hair and beard provoked much notice, especially because of the European tradition that red hair and freckles were signs of Jewishness.¹⁴⁸ At the University of Helmstedt, Seton was hosted by another wandering Scot, Dr. Duncan Liddell, who served as dean of faculty and achieved distinction in mathematics and medicine. Liddell had earlier visited Tycho Brahe at Uraniborg and shared the Dane's Hermetic interests.¹⁴⁹

Seton's fame led to his imprisonment and torture by Christian II, Elector of Saxony, who was determined to acquire the secret of his alchemical powder. After the frightened Hamilton escaped and returned to Scotland, Seton was rescued by Michael Sendivogius, a

¹⁴⁶ E.J. Holmyard, *Alchemy* (1957; rpt. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968), 223–38; John Read, *Humour and Humanism in Chemistry* (London: G. Bell, 1947), 38–65. Seton may have been an expatriate Scot, possibly a Catholic Marian exile. Professor Włodzimierz Hubicki argues that Seton was really an Italian "impostor-charlatan-illusionist" named Gorolamo vel Hieronymus Scotto of Parma (b. ca. 1540); see his article, "The Mystery of Alexander Seton, the Cosmopolite," *Proceedings of the XIV International Congress of the History of Science* (Tokyo-Kyoto, 1974), II, 397–400.

¹⁴⁷ Seton's heavy debt to Lull is revealed in the edition of his work by Michael Sendivogius, *A New Light on Alchemy*, trans. John French (London, 1650).

¹⁴⁸ See Fabre-Vassas, *Singular Beast*, 105–09.

¹⁴⁹ J. Dreyer, *Tycho Brahe*, 137.

Polish alchemist, who carried him off to Cracow.¹⁵⁰ As the weakened Seton approached death in early 1604, he gave Sendivogius the remains of his powder. The rescuer then married Seton's widow, who handed over her husband's alchemical manuscript, which Sendivogius published as *Novum Lumen Chymicum* (1604). Taking up his mentor's title of "Cosmopolite," Sendivogius soon gained a sensational reputation, which led the Emperor Rudolph II to invite him to his Hermetic court in Prague, where the alchemist was made a counsellor until his own imprisonment and subsequent disappearance from 1607 to 1625.

It is unknown whether Seton's assistant Hamilton continued to practice alchemy after his return to Scotland, but Liddell went on to achieve fame as a professor of mathematics after his return to Aberdeen in 1607. It seems likely that both men kept up their contacts in Germany, which may account for the visit of a German alchemist to Scotland at this time. In November 1607 John Napier journeyed from Merchiston to Edinburgh to consult with Dr. Daniel Müller, who believed that he was dying and wanted to pass on his secrets to his Scottish collaborator.¹⁵¹ Müller, who utilized the techniques of Seton and Sendivogius, was awaiting the return of his "credible friend" Lionel Struthers from Istria in Germany, where he hoped to obtain a supply of the crude mercury with which Müller claimed to achieve transmutations. He also showed Napier his little cipher table entitled "*Medulla philosophiae Hermeticae*." Citing from memory many sources (ranging from Ficino to Trevisano), Müller instructed Napier, who attempted the experiments without success. Finally, in March 1608, Müller reported that Struthers had arrived with the Istrian mercury, and Napier planned to proceed on their project.

Müller had connections with the court of Hesse-Darmstadt, which would soon witness stirrings of Rosicrucianism, and McLean suggests that he was sent to Scotland as an "ambassador" of the German

¹⁵⁰ W. Hubicki disputes the traditional Scottish version of the Seton-Sendivogius relationship; see his articles, "Michael Sendivogius," in C. Gillespie, *Dictionary*, and "The True Life of Michael Sendivogius," *Actes du XI Congrès international d'histoire des sciences*, IV (Warsaw, 1965), 98–103. However, for the purposes of this study, the traditional account—which was widely believed in the seventeenth century—is the more relevant one.

¹⁵¹ For Napier's account of their conversations, see J. Small, "Sketches of Later Scottish Alchemists," *Proceedings of Society of Scottish Antiquaries* (1876), 412–15.

Hermeticists who launched that movement.¹⁵² McLean also argues that the Scottish "school" of alchemists included John Napier, the Duke of Argyll (also Müller's pupil), Patrick Ruthven, George Erskine of Innerteil, and William Drummond of Hawthornden. Müller extracted "a severe oath of secrecy" from his pupils, so little more is known about his activities in Scotland—except from the surviving manuscripts of the alchemical processes he wrote down for Argyll. As we shall see, these manuscripts would later influence the Rosicrucian writings of the English Freemason, Elias Ashmole, who maintained contacts with Scottish Rosicrucians in the 1650's.

In 1608 another German alchemist with Scottish contacts arrived at the Hermetic court of Rudolph II in Prague. Michael Maier had studied medicine at the University of Rostock, where Liddell and two other Scotsmen, Dr. John Johnston and Thomas Reid, were fellow students; he would later refer to Scottish friends who shared his alchemical interests.¹⁵³ Impressed by Maier's Hermetic expertise, Rudolph elevated him to Count Palatine and made him his personal physician. In 1611 Maier sent an elaborate emblematic Christmas greeting to James I, which featured an eight-petalled rose with a cross, possibly at the urging of the emperor. In July 1612 the chemist Johann Hartmann reported that Maier had gone to London with a "Carmen gratulatorium" for the Elector Palatine and his bride to be, Princess Elizabeth Stuart.¹⁵⁴ On 6 November he was among the Elector's "gentlemen," who attended the funeral of Prince Henry. While Maier was in London, his patron Rudolph died, and there was great unrest among the German Protestants who feared that the ineffective rule of the late emperor's brother would open the door to reactionary Catholicism.

Fueling that unrest were various apocalyptic manuscripts that circulated throughout the German territories. In 1604 Simon Studion dedicated a two-thousand page treatise, *Naometria* ("mystical measurement") to the Duke of Württemberg. Waite stresses Studion's

¹⁵² Adam McLean, "Alchemy in Scotland—a 17th Century Text," *HJ*, 2 (1978), 40–44, and "Müller's Process," *HJ*, 12 (1989), 27–33. See also Ron Heisler, "Robert Fludd: A Picture in Need of Expansion," *HJ* (1989), 139–40.

¹⁵³ John Read, *Prelude to Chemistry* (New York: Macmillan, 1937), 230; Ron Heisler, "Rosicrucianism: The First Blooming in Britain," *HJ* (1989), 32.

¹⁵⁴ Adam McLean, "A Rosicrucian Manuscript of Michael Maier," *HJ*, 5 (1979), 5–7; Ron Heisler, "Michael Maier and England," *HJ* (1989), 119.

claim that he had received the prophetic power “given to the Lion of the Tribe of Judah and the Root of David” and that he drew on traditions of Jewish mysticism:

The symbolical expression is reminiscent of Kabbalistic or pre-Kabbalistic tracts on the *Delineation of the Celestial Temples*, the *Measurement of the Divine Body*, and R. Eliezer's *Measurement of the Earthly Temple*, but the immediate allusion is to the *Apocalypse*, X, 1: “And there was given to me a reed like a rod; and the angel stood, saying: Rise, and measure the Temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein.” For this reason the sub-title of the manuscript is termed “a naked and prime opening of the book [Bible] written—within and without—by the key of David and the reed like unto a rod.”¹⁵⁵

Studion described a *Militia Crucifera Evangelica*, which was modelled on the crusading orders under Godfrey of Bouillon, who took Jerusalem and was a type of “our new king,” and on the Teutonic Order, which absorbed the traditions of the Knights Templar.¹⁵⁶ He also described a diplomatic meeting which allegedly took place at Lüneberg in 1586, where “some evangelical Princes and Electors” met with representatives of the kings of Navarre and Denmark and the queen of England, to form a “Confederatio Militiae Evangelicae” against the Catholic League.¹⁵⁷ The German evangelicals took the name *cruce signati* and discussed the adoption of a new cross as a sign for the the Third Age of the Spirit.¹⁵⁸

This linking of Cabalistic Temple mysticism with Templar-Teutonic-Crusader traditions recalls the similar earlier linking in Scotland and points forward to the Cabalistic-Templar degrees of *Écossais* Freemasonry in the eighteenth century. Thus, it is suggestive that Sendivogius, the disciple of the Scottish alchemist Seton, was invited to the court of Frederick of Würtemberg circa 1606–07, at a time when the *Naometria* was being studied.¹⁵⁹ In the manuscript, Studion also discussed the numerical value of the letters in the Hebrew word for “rose,” which he connected by *gematria* with the date of the founding of the Teutonic Order. He then connected the rose with the cross

¹⁵⁵ Arthur E. Waite, *The Brotherhood of the Rosy Cross* (1924; rpt. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1993), 44.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 641.

¹⁵⁷ F. Yates, *Rosicrucian*, 34–35.

¹⁵⁸ S. Akerman, *Rose Cross*, 99–102.

¹⁵⁹ E. Holmyard, *Alchemy*, 234–35.

by *gematria* and illustrated their mystical significance with a drawing of the cross embedded in a multi-petalled rose. This amalgam of Temple-Rose-Cross power would usher in a reformation of the world.

In an appendix to *Naometria*, entitled "Hieroglyphica Simone Studionis," the author delivered a "political instruction" in the form of a musical composition, which expressed the hope that Henri IV, Frederick of Würtemberg, and James I would initiate a new confederation against the Papacy. It is presently unknown whether James learned of Studion's politically-programmatic "song," but in 1604 its militant message would not have appealed to the king, who was determined to peacefully reconcile Protestants and Catholics. However, the shock of the Catholic Gunpowder Plot in 1605 and the assassination of Henri IV in 1610 moved James closer to the Protestant princes of Germany. During the next few years, a flurry of apocalyptic manuscripts circulated through Germany which echoed Studion's predictions of a chivalric rose-cross crusade to defeat the Papist anti-christ.

In 1610 in the Tyrol, Adam Haselmeyer read a manuscript entitled *Allgemeine und General Reformation, der gantzen weiten Welt. Beneben der Fama Fraternitatis dess Löblichen Ordens des Rosenkreutzes, an alle gelehrte und Häupter Europae geschrieben*, and he published a response to it in 1612. In 1614 at Cassel, an edition of the *Fama Fraternitatis* appeared, which included a German translation of Chapter 77 of Traiano Boccalini's satirical *Ragguagli di Parnaso* and Haselmeyer's reply. The *Fama* author was interested in Boccalini's call for "a General Reformation of the World," but the Italian's work also had a particular appeal to Scots, for he had been a close friend of the Admirable Crichton, whom he praised as "a Scotchman, the Prodigie of Nature for Learning."¹⁶⁰ Boccalini described Crichton's challenge to the pedantic virtuosi who could not believe "a young fellow of but 25 years of age" could "be exactly knowing in all sciences." This connection of a Scottish master of the Art of Memory with the Rosicrucian call for universal reformation was especially relevant to the Scottish supporters of James I, former classmate of Crichton. Boccalini and his contemporaries believed Crichton was a member of the royal Stuart family and that his ancestors led the armies that drove the English

¹⁶⁰ P. Tytler, *Crichton*, 47, 83, 122; Traiano Boccalini, *Ragguagli di Parnasso: or, Advertisements from Parnassus*, 3rd rev. ed., trans. Henry, Earl of Monmouth (London: Peter Parker, 1674), 54, 94-104.

out of Scotland. Advocating liberty of conscience, Boccalini called for an end to the enmity between Scots and English, “who should be brothers,” and he argued against violent attempts at reformation.

With this combined publication of the *Fama* and the *Ragguagli* chapter, the controversial Rosicrucian movement was officially launched. According to Yates, the movement was encouraged by the marriage of Elizabeth Stuart to the Elector Palatine, which led the radical Protestants in Germany to expect the support of James I for their anti-Catholic campaign.¹⁶¹ She also argues that the anonymous authors of the Rosicrucian tracts were inspired by the earlier political and occultist activities of John Dee, whose *Monas Hieroglyphica* was utilized in a second publication, *Secretioris Philosophiae Consideratio brevis a Phillip a Gabella* (Cassel, 1615). Yates raises important questions about the role of Dee in establishing a kind of “pre-masonry” and about the relationship of Rosicrucianism to English Freemasonry. However, the research of later scholars such as Moran, Heisler, McLean, Akerman, and Dickson has revealed that Yates’s Anglocentrism prevented her from unearthing the German, Swedish, Baltic, Scottish, and more widespread roots and ramifications of the movement.¹⁶² Thus, though Dee had no influence on Elizabethan “Freemasonry,” which did not exist in the modern sense of the term, his influence on the Napier family, Robert Kerr, and James Cleland may have influenced Scottish Freemasonry, which assimilated Rosicrucianism into its teachings and which eventually travelled south into England.

The Dee-Napier connection was revived by the return in 1609 of Arthur Dee, the magus’s son, from his medical studies at Basle. Arthur had witnessed his father’s alchemical and Cabalistic experiments in Bohemia, and he continued to investigate the occult sciences. Practising as an unlicensed Hermetic physician in London, he resumed his father’s friendship with Dr. Richard Napier of Linford, who shared his alchemical-astrological approach to medicine.¹⁶³ Despite

¹⁶¹ F. Yates, *Rosicrucian*, 30–40, 206–19.

¹⁶² R. Heisler, “Rosicrucianism,” 30–61; Adam McLean, *A Compendium of the Rosicrucian Vault*, Hermetic Research Series no. 4 (Edinburgh, 1985), 1–17; Bruce Moran, *The Alchemical World of the German Court: Occult Philosophy and Chemical Medicine in the Circle of Moritz of Hessen (1572–1632)* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1991); S. Akerman, *Rose Cross*, passim; Donald Dickson, *The Tessera of Antilia: Utopian Brotherhoods and Secret Societies in the Early Seventeenth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 1998).

¹⁶³ Stanton Linden, “Arthur Dee and Johannes Bánfi Hunyades: Further Information on their Alchemical and Professional Activities,” *Ambix*, 24 (1977), 98–99.

attempts by the Royal College of Physicians to prohibit Arthur Dee's practice, he gained the favor of Queen Anne and became her physician by 1614. His service to the queen would later be praised by King James and Prince Charles. In 1634 Arthur would publish an address to the "Fratribus Roseae Crucis," which suggested his early and enduring interest in the movement.

That the Dees' connection with the Napiers had a Scottish impact is reinforced by the fact that the earliest known references in English to the Rosicrucian movement were made by the Scottish mathematician and courtier James Maxwell in 1614 and that the earliest "English" translations of the *Fama* were made by Scots in the 1620's. As we shall see, the Scottish translators had connections with Freemasonry, and the Rosicrucian-Masonic assimilation would be published in *The Muses Threnodie* in 1638. Thus, it will be useful to examine those elements in the *Fama* that were most likely to appeal to Scottish "illuminists."

The question of authorship of the *Fama* remains controversial, though current scholarship suggests composite authorship by Johan Valentin Andreae and his colleagues at Tübingen.¹⁶⁴ According to the text, the "highly illuminated father" of the fraternity was C.R. (Christian Rosencreutz), whom Andreae had featured in an earlier alchemical romance. When C.R. travelled to Cyprus, Jerusalem, Damcar, Egypt, and Morocco in search of occult illumination, he was given the magical "book M.," which he translated into Latin, and the secrets of Cabala, which he purified from its Jewish and Islamic corruptions.¹⁶⁵ Brother C.R. then sailed to Spain, where he was disappointed at the reaction of the learned to his revelations. After further frustrations in other nations, he returned to Germany, where he "built a fitting and neat habitation," and devoted himself to the study of mathematics and construction of scientific instruments. Five years later, C.R. called together three friends to form the Fraternity of the Rose Cross, and they "made the magical language and writing, together with a large dictionary," and "made the first part of the book M."

When the new building (called *Sancti spiritus*) was finished, they

¹⁶⁴ D. Dickson, *Tessera*, 18-88; J.V. Andreae, *Christianopolis*, trans. Edward J. Thompson (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1999), introd., 15-19.

¹⁶⁵ F. Yates, *Rosicrucian*, 238-51; based on Thomas Vaughan's English translation of 1652.

decided to recruit more members who collected a book “of all that which man can desire, wish, or hope for.” They also laid down the *axiomata* of the fraternity:

First, That none of them should profess any other thing than to cure the sick, and that *gratis*. 2. None of the posterity should be constrained to wear one certain kind of habit, but therein to follow the custom of the country. 3. That every year upon the day C. they should meet together in the house S. *Spiritus*, or write the cause of his absence. 4. Every brother should look about for a worthy person, who, after his decease might succeed him. 5. The word C.R. should be their seal, mark, and character. 6. The Fraternity should remain secret one hundred years.¹⁶⁶

The first of the fraternity who died was J.O., who was in England where he cured a young Earl of Norfolk of leprosy. J.O. was “very expert, and well learned in Cabala, as his book called H. witnesseth.”

The brothers could not foretell anyone’s death, even though they seemed to be masters of the Lullian art (“before our eyes we behold the image and pattern of all the world”). Their “artificial” *Rota mundi* was probably a Lullian memory wheel. Brother C.R. died and was buried, but the next generations did not know the location of his vault. Then Brother N.N., who resided in *Gallia Narbonensis*, undertook a “masonic” project (in 1604):

[N.N] was minded now to travel, being for that purpose sufficiently provided with Fortunatus’ purse, he thought (he being a good architect) to alter something of his building and to make it more fit. In such renewing he lighted upon the memorial tablet which was cast of brass and containeth all the names of the brethren, with some few other things. This he would transfer to another more fitting vault . . . In this table stuck a great nail somewhat strong, so that when it was with force drawn out, he took with him an indifferently big stone out of the thin wall, or plastering, of the hidden door, and so, unlooked for, uncovered the door . . . also shall there be opened a door to Europe (when the wall is removed) which already doth begin to appear . . .¹⁶⁷

Stevenson stresses that “the discovery of the tomb had taken place because an architect had been exercising his skills. Had there been no architect among the brothers, there would have been no new age dawning.”¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., 243.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., 245.

¹⁶⁸ See D. Stevenson’s comment, *Origins*, 103.

The importance attached to the architect's role in rebuilding the house of the Holy Spirit and recovering the lost magical book would certainly appeal to Scottish Freemasons. The *Fama* goes on to describe the mystical geometry of the vault, which Brother C.R. designed to be "a microcosm corresponding in all motions to the macrocosm." Suffused by the light of the interior sun, the brothers found more magical books and instruments, and finally the perfectly preserved body of C.R. The brothers invited all the learned of Europe to examine their philosophy, which is "not a new invention, but as Adam after his fall hath received it, and as Moses and Solomon used it." Praising Paracelsus, they called for a reform of alchemy to remove it from crass gold-making, and identifying themselves as "reformed" Germans, they called for a renovation of learning and international sharing of discoveries.

Michael Maier, the German alchemist who would later publish defenses of the Rosicrucians, said that he first learned about them in England during his visit of 1612–16. He also referred to his Scottish contacts at that time. Thus, he may have met James Maxwell, who was living in London and who seemed to respond to the *Fama* (and perhaps the *Naometria*) in a treatise written in 1614. As a young man in the 1590's, Maxwell was "a member of a self-conscious group of Edinburgh mathematicians, astrologers, and apocalyptic exegetes," whose leader was John Napier.¹⁶⁹ Maxwell had intended to study mathematics, astrology, and philosophy under Tycho Brahe but was persuaded to attend the University of Edinburgh instead.¹⁷⁰ From 1601 to 1607, Maxwell travelled in Europe, immersing himself in studies of Plato, Hermes Trismegistus, Pico, Ficino, and Patricius. Perhaps through the German contacts of Napier, as well as William Hamilton and the Rostock graduates, Maxwell learned German and visited Heidelberg and other German courts.¹⁷¹ On his return to England, he joined the entourages of Prince Henry and Princess Elizabeth, while he attempted to make a living as a literary virtuoso. In the tracts he published in 1611–13, he revealed an essentially "Masonic" mentality that explains his apparent interest in the *Fama*.

¹⁶⁹ A. Williamson, *Scottish National Consciousness*, 103–06.

¹⁷⁰ See his autobiographical account in James Maxwell, *A New Eight-fold Probation of the Church of England's Divine Constitution* (London: Legatt, 1617), preface.

¹⁷¹ In his *Monument of Remembrance* (1613), praising the marriage of Elizabeth Stuart to Frederick of the Palatinate, he gives detailed descriptions of Heidelberg which suggest his earlier visit there.

Maxwell dedicated *The Golden Art, or the Right Way of Enriching* (1611) to the cities of London and Edinburgh, and the “Deane of Guild,” “the whole Worshipfull Corporations and Companies thereof,” alderman, baillies, and sheriffs. The uniting of the two cities formed “Jamesanna, the patterne of a perfect city,” which would follow in the tradition of kings David and Solomon. Like Dee and Napier, Maxwell urged the reformation and elevation of the mechanical crafts as a means of improving the commonwealth:

Likewise must the tradesman or craftsman bee carefull to grow expert and cunning in his craft, and wise in his occupation, that he may be praised for his great skill like *Bezaleel* and *Aholiab* . . . of whom it is said that God filled them with an excellent Spirit of Wisdom . . . in all craftsmanship.¹⁷²

In Scottish masonic lore, Aholiab was honored as an architect of the tribe of Dan, who was appointed with Bezalel to construct the Tabernacle.¹⁷³ Maxwell further stressed that Joseph and his son Jesus were carpenters, while Paul was a tentmaker.

He then supported James’s desire to improve ecclesiastical architecture—an agenda that was frustrated by carping and stingy Puritans: “In our day, when any motion chanceth to bee made for the building and repairing of churches . . . forthwith will these Church-banes, object with Judas: what needs all this waste?”¹⁷⁴ The king’s opponents hurled charges of Popery at all devout people who wanted to beautify churches. But, “they will bestow more upon their horses, their hawkes, and their houndes . . . more upon the building of a Kitchin, then of a Kyrke.” Then, in a refrain he would use repeatedly, Maxwell urged the new “Britains” to live up to their Judaic heritage: “We see how sharpley God had punished mens niggardness and slowness about the building and beautifying of his house; and are not we bound to have an house of praier . . . as were the Israelites of old?”

In the same year, Maxwell dedicated *The Golden Legend, or the Mirrour of Religious Men and Godly Matrones* (1611) to Lord Harington and his wife, the governess of Princess Elizabeth. He would later boast that Elizabeth studied this marriage manual which was based on Biblical

¹⁷² James Maxwell, *The Golden Art* (London: William Leake, 1611), 22.

¹⁷³ K. Mackenzie, *Royal Masonic*, 28, 74.

¹⁷⁴ J. Maxwell, *Golden Art*, 195–98.

stories of ardent and constant love. Thus, it is significant that Maxwell re-emphasized the "Masonic" message of *The Golden Art*:

Neither let a man be ashamed of a mechanical trade, for we see that Joseph . . . and Jesus . . . yea, the Sonne of God disdained not to play the Carpenter . . . Saint Paul was a maker of Tents. And it is recorded of *Bezaleel* and *Aholiab* two Tradesmen that God gave them such a knowledge in mechanall things . . . Let no man I say then be ashamed of a mechanall Trade or Craft, seeing it is a gift of God's Spirit, and that (as *Siracides* saith) *in the hands of the craftes-man shall the workes be commended.* [Eccles. 9.19.]¹⁷⁵

That Cabalistic sexual symbolism and theories of conjugal love may have formed part of masonic lore means that Maxwell's linking of the marital and masonic arts was appropriate in a treatise for the daughter of a "Mason King."

In *The Laudable Life and Deplorable Death of Prince Henry* (1612), Maxwell referred to the seven hundred souls employed by the prince, and his detailed descriptions of Henry's activities suggest his own participation in the court. As a mathematician and advocate for craftsmen, he was especially pleased by the prince's delight in architecture, landscape design, and the military arts. Despite the tragedy of Henry's early death, Maxwell believed that his sister Elizabeth and her new husband Frederick would help King James fulfill the prophecies of Paracelsus and Nostradamus about a union of the Northern Princes, whereby the Turks would be overthrown.

In *A Monument of Remembrance* (1613), in honor of the departure of Elizabeth and Frederick for Heidelberg, Maxwell announced to the Germans that Elizabeth carried the blood of Gathelus and Scota, descendants of Isis and Osiris and "progenitors of the most part of our islanders."¹⁷⁶ She would transmit this Egyptian mystical heritage to Germany, where her conjugal union would embody the secret sense of matrimonial love between the palm trees, whereby "the learned Egyptians and Greeks make the Palms bee the Hieroglyphick of love between man and wife." Then, with the almost zany syncretism that would characterize later Rosicrucian and Masonic writing, Maxwell made James into "this Island's Aesclepius," who would

¹⁷⁵ James Maxwell, *The Golden Legend* (London: E. White, 1611), 156.

¹⁷⁶ See James Maxwell, *A Monument of Remembrance* (London: Nicholas Oker, 1613), passages 17, 38, 51. The prophecy about the Northern Princes is in passages 14 and 75.

preside over the “mysticall May-Pole of a Palme-tree from holy Palestine,” who would receive the Golden Fleece from “Jasons Sydereall ship,” and who would finally climb Mount Olivet, accompanied by singing Hebrews, while he christened Jews and crowned Jerusalem.

In the 1613 works, this conglomerate of Masonic, Egyptian, neo-Platonic, Hermetic, and Cabalistic images was incorporated into the image of the rose, “the hieroglyphic of love,” which was the emblem of Elizabeth Stuart. Thus, in 1614, when the first Rosicrucian manifesto further glorified the rose, it struck a responsive chord in Maxwell. Though he had studied prophetic and millenial literature for years, his specific allusions to rose-cross symbolism in *Admirable and Notable Prophecies* (1614) suggest his familiarity with the *Fama*. He described a great reformation and unification of the Christian empire:

... a certaine Prince shall call a generall councill for the clearing of the obscured truth, and the reformation of the Church, and the red Flowers shall distill or drop downe a sweet savoury water; meaning belike that from the Ile of *Britany*, especially from the most happy Country of England: whose royall Ensigne is the united white-red Rose ... And the Germaine Hermite and prophetier *Paracelus* whome we alleaged before in 26. Prediction, the Image whereof is a Crowne with a Rose, or a Rosen Crown, with the letter F seated or planted upon the same ... a certaine English Prince, whose name should begin with F, as for example, Frederike ...¹⁷⁷

Maxwell reinforced the importance of the “Rose Crown” movement with prophecies from Nostradamus and Joachim of Fiore (“the red Roses shall send foorth the sweet water that shall purifie and cleanse the Church”). For Maxwell, even more telling was the prophecy recently found in an ancient manuscript by “Maister S. George Norry, King at Armes,” that “the Rose of England beareth and bringeth the Crosse of Christ to forraigne lands.”¹⁷⁸

The parallels between the thinking of Maxwell and the author of the *Fama* are further illustrated by the Scot’s description of a vault that was opened by masons. In 1593, while an abbot of Calabria was rebuilding his monastery, “his Masons were casting down an old wall ... and digging deepe to lay a new foundation.” There they found a sepulcher of stone, with a corpse almost consumed, hold-

¹⁷⁷ James Maxwell, *Admirable and Notable Prophecies, Uttered in Former Times by Twenty-four Famous Roman Catholics* (1614; London: Ed. Alde, 1615), 62–63.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 86–87.

ing in the hand a plate of silver with this inscription, "When the holy Citie shall be enlightend by a bright starre, then shall the Sunne see me again." Under the head was a marble chest which held a leaden box "containing a certaine parchment, wherein was written a Prophetie in old Characters." The prophecy underlined the Rose-Crown-Cross movement, which now needed a Solomonic-Masonic king to fulfill it:

... there would be a Salomon, that is to say, some wise and peaceable Prince, to send unto the *Hirams* of Christendome for their supplie of materialls, for the worke of the Temple of Concorde . . . And certainlie howsoever the Controversies of Christians be both many and weightie; Yet if the seven Kings of Christendome now living . . . would but take as much paines for the calming and composing of the divisions of the Church, as once Ptolemie King of *Egypt* did for the translating of the olde Testament out of *Hebrew* into Greeke by the meanes of his seventie two Interpreters, I am perswaded that the God of Peace would bless the businesse . . .¹⁷⁹

As Maxwell adroitly linked James's "Egyptian-Hebraic" project of Bible translation with the building of the Temple by Solomon and Hiram Abif, his master mason, he also made clear that the cleansing of the Temple could be peaceful; it did not require military destruction. He also referred to another Masonic-sounding treatise, entitled "A Tower against all sortes of Tentations, builded of Stones, hewed out of the quarry of holy Scripture, containing divers divine and Godly Meditations."¹⁸⁰ In order to bolster the crusade of the Rose-Crown-Cross and the Temple of Concord, Maxwell drew on a startling range of prophets—including Zozimos, Joachim of Fiore, Trithemius, and Lichtenberg. Always the patriotic Scot, he assured his readers that although the Welsh Merlin had been condemned as a magician, the Caledonian Merlin was reckoned "among the better sort of British prophets." Moreover, the better Merlin and the Scottish prophet Thomas Rymer agreed about the corruption of the Church of Rome. As Arthur Williamson concludes, Maxwell was "Scotland's counterpart to such contemporaries as Italy's Tomasso Campanella, France's Guillaume Postel, England's John Dee, Sweden's Johannes Bureus, or the authors of the *Fama* and *Confessio* in Germany."¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., 155.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid., A4, 14, 78, 88, A. I have not found a copy of this treatise.

¹⁸¹ Arthur Williamson, "George Buchanan, Civic Virtue, and Commerce: European Imperialism and its 16th-Century Critics," *SHR*, 75 (1996), 34.

If Maier heard about the Rosicrucian manifestoes from James Maxwell, he may have met him through mutual Scottish friends. One candidate for an introduction is Sir Richard Preston, Lord Dingwall, a Scottish favorite of King James. While serving as instructor in arms to Prince Henry, Preston almost certainly knew Maxwell, who spent much time observing Henry's military training.¹⁸² Preston's expertise in fortification, troop deployment, and siege mining were considered the provenance of Freemasonry in Scotland, and he also participated in the architectural masques of Inigo Jones. Like Maxwell, Preston was interested in alchemy and Maier included him among the dedicatees of his *Arcana arcanissima* (London, 1614).

However, the most intriguing possibilities for Maier's Scottish contacts are Sir George Erskine of Innerteil and Sir Robert Kerr, who would later produce the first "English" translations of the Rosicrucian treatises. James had appointed Erskine, his old classmate, as a judge and member of the Scottish Privy Council.¹⁸³ In Erskine's surviving papers, he revealed Hermetic interests remarkably similar to those of Maier, as evidenced by his manuscript of Thomas Norton's *Ordinall of Alchimy*.¹⁸⁴ According to Ashmole, Maier's main purpose in coming to London was to learn English in order to translate Norton's work into Latin.¹⁸⁵ Erskine copied Norton's assertion that not only lords but common workmen loved the craft of alchemy; among those workmen were the "frie massons."

That Erskine collaborated with John Napier, who also combined interests in masonry and alchemy, suggests another early link between Scottish Freemasonry and Rosicrucianism. In 1599 Erskine made alchemical notes while in the home of Napier, whom he called "Bro: Mirabilis = Marchi-stone."¹⁸⁶ He also revealed his studies in Cardano, Lull, Arnold de Villanova, and his special interest in Pythagoreanism. From the writings of the Lullist Arnold, he made a complex drawing of thirteen concentric circles, with tiny writing inside, which suggests an alchemical version of the Memory Wheel. Immediately following this drawing was Erskine's hand-written "Epitome of Architecture,"

¹⁸² K. Figala and U. Neumann, "Maier," 132.

¹⁸³ A. McLean, "Rosicrucian Manuscript," 7.

¹⁸⁴ Royal College of Physicians, Edinburgh: Sir George Erskine Alchemical MSS, vols. 1-6.

¹⁸⁵ E. Ashmole, *Theatrum Chemicum*, ii.

¹⁸⁶ Erskine MS. II, ff. 1-6; V, AB 4/22; IV, AB 4/21.

in which he applied Lullist and Vitruvian principles to the organization of practical building needs.

McLean argues that Erskine's Scots-English translation of the *Fama* was copied from a manuscript transcribed by Robert Kerr around 1620, from an original translation made some years earlier.¹⁸⁷ After Kerr's appointment as Captain of His Majesty's Guard, he was frequently in Scotland until 1613, when he returned to London and accelerated his occult studies. That he met Maier is suggested by his subsequent acquisition of the German's Rosicrucian treatise, *Themis Aurea* (1618), as well as many other works on the movement.¹⁸⁸ Perhaps Maxwell served as an intermediary between the Scots and Maier, who evidently inspired Kerr and Erskine to follow Rosicrucian developments on the Continent. According to Erskine's grandson, Lord Cromartie, he had "a considerable correspondence in very remote parts with the sonnes of Hermes," which he carried on secretly and at great expense.¹⁸⁹ One of these, Dr. Politius (from Poland or Silesia) was eventually sent to Erskine as an agent of the Rosicrucians "at Hess." We will return to the Kerr-Erskine alchemical network in Chapter Six, when it sheds new light on Charles I's Rosicrucian interests.

In the meantime, while Maier was still in London, Erskine's alchemical collaborator John Napier brought to completion his epoch-making treatise on logarithms, *Mirifici Logarithmorum Canonis Descriptio* (Edinburgh, 1614). Napier dedicated the work to Prince Charles, whose mathematical interests had been stimulated by his former guardian, Alexander Seton, Lord Dunfermline. Through their mutual mathematical and architectural studies, Napier and Dunfermline had become close friends.¹⁹⁰ As noted earlier, both men had frequent dealings with Freemasons and were probably initiates. In Napier's dedication, he stressed the importance of his system in helping "the weakness of memory," which is a major obstacle to mathematical expertise. He then praised mathematics as the preeminent science:

¹⁸⁷ Adam McLean, "The Manuscript Sources of the English Translations of the Rosicrucian Manifestoes," paper presented at Conference on "Rosenkreuz als europäisches Phänomen im 17. Jahrhundert," at Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel (1994). I am grateful to McLean for allowing me to use this important paper.

¹⁸⁸ Kerr's library.

¹⁸⁹ J.B. Craven, "A Scottish Alchemist of the Seventeenth Century:—David, Lord Balcarras, *Journal of the Alchemical Society*, I (1913), 68.

¹⁹⁰ A. Williamson, "Number," 206.

Seeing there is neither study nor any kind of learning that doth more acuate and stir up generous and heroical wits to excellent and eminent affairs; and contrariwise, that doth more deject and keep down sottish and dull minds than the mathematics; it is no wonder that learned and magnanimous princes in all former ages have taken great delight in them, and that unskilful and slothful men have always pursued them with most cruel hatred, as utter enemies to their ignorance and sluggishness.¹⁹¹

Napier may have been thinking of the persecution of John Dee by the ignorant rabble, for he himself was under suspicion locally “of being in league with the powers of darkness.” Among Napier’s first readers was John Marr, “a mathematician attached to the household of King James,” who had earlier examined the manuscripts of Dee.¹⁹²

In the meantime at Cassel, another Rosicrucian tract appeared which drew heavily on Dee’s *Monas Hieroglyphica*. In the *Secretioris Philosophiae Consideratio brevis a Philip a Gabella* (1615), the author repeated the Biblical verses that Dee gave on the title-page of *Monas*: “De rore coeli et pinguedine terrae det tibi Deus.”¹⁹³ Dee illustrated this verse with a theme of descending dew (*ros*) which unites heaven and earth. The Gabella tract was bound with the *Confessione Fraternitatis R.C.*, which qualified the attack on alchemy in the *Fama* to mean only spurious and avaricious alchemy, not the legitimate art. Thus, the use of Dee’s inscription helped to emphasize the alchemical significance of *Ros* (dew) and *Crux* (light). Unlike the *Fama*, which was published in German, the *Confessio* was in Latin and addressed to all the learned of Europe. Despite the increased emphasis on a reform of alchemy, the *Confessio* still included architectural imagery that would, like the *Fama*, appeal to Scottish Freemasons:

... the meditations, knowledge, and inventions of our loving Christian Father ... are so excellent, worthy, and great, that if all books should perish ... yet the posterity will be able only thereby to lay a new foundation, and bring truth to light again; the which perhaps would not be so hard to do as if one should begin to pull down and destroy the old ruinous building, and then to enlarge the fore court, afterwards bring lights in the lodgings, and then change the doors, stair, and other things according to our intention.¹⁹⁴

¹⁹¹ M. Napier, *Memoirs*, 380–81.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, 406–07.

¹⁹³ F. Yates, *Rosicrucian*, 46–47.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 253–56.

The author then predicted that "it shall happen first that the stones shall arise, and offer their service" to the great reformation. It was perhaps no coincidence that Erskine, composer of "The Epitome of Architecture," and Kerr, student and practitioner of architecture, acquired Scots-English translations of the *Confessio*.¹⁹⁵

The *Monas Hieroglyphica* and *Fama Fraternitatis* also found their way into the library of the Grand Duke of Tuscany, who was served by two Scottish brothers, James and John Macolo (McColl), both considered masters of the Art of Lull.¹⁹⁶ Before coming to Italy, James had been the first Scottish medical student to matriculate at Leiden.¹⁹⁷ He then served as physician to Cosimo II and published Hermetic medical tracts. John maintained an alchemical lab and acquired Hermetic books which he sold to the Grand Duke. The brothers' occult interests brought suspicions of heresy upon them, and a hostile Scottish priest reported that James had been a Calvinist in Britain and a Lutheran in France, while John had become a Jew ("Giovanni era circonciso"). The Lullist alchemical circle in Tuscany obtained many books published by the Rosicrucian network in Germany, and by the time the Scottish "maestros" returned to London, they were well acquainted with the whole movement. Thus, the fact that James Macolo became the physician and John Macolo the confidential servant of King James (circa 1617–22) suggests another Scottish channel of Lullist-Rosicrucian notions into British Masonic circles.¹⁹⁸

The odd charge that John Macolo had become a Jew was probably based on his studies in Cabala, though he may also have boasted of Scotland's Jewish heritage. In 1616, during his last year in Italy, the Rosicrucians were also accused of Judaizing themselves, especially by Andreas Libavius, who charged that the Cabalistic book of angel magic, the *Sefer-ha-Raziel*, was the source book for the movement.¹⁹⁹ When the Macolos arrived in England, they would soon

¹⁹⁵ Erskine Alchemical MSS., IV, 31 ff.; R. Kerr, *Correspondence*, I, 62–76; A. McLean, "Manuscript Sources."

¹⁹⁶ Paolo Galluzzi, "Motivi Paracelsiani nella Toscana di Cosimo II e di Don Antonio dei Medici: Alchimia, Medicina, 'Chimica,' e Riforma del Sapere," in *Scienze Credenze Occulte Livelli di Cultura* (Firenze: Leo Olschki, 1982), 44–47, 57–58.

¹⁹⁷ Helen Dingwall, *Physicians, Surgeons, and Apothecaries: Medicine in Seventeenth-century Edinburgh* (East Linton: Tuckwell, 1995), 101.

¹⁹⁸ For their position with James, see *HMC. Report on the MSS. of the Earl of Mar and Kellie Preserved at Alloa House* (London, 1904), 119.

¹⁹⁹ Andreas Libavius, *Wohlmeinendes Bedencken der Fama und Confession der Bruderschaft*

learn that King James's team of Biblical scholars had elevated the study of Cabala into Anglican respectability. Seven years earlier, when James finally lured the great Huguenot philologist Isaac Casaubon to England, he gained access to the brilliant Cabalistic scholarship of another wandering Scot, James "Bonaventura" Hepburn, whom Casaubon had patronized in France.

While studying at St. Andrews in the 1580's, Hepburn became fascinated by Oriental languages and determined to pursue his studies in the Middle East.²⁰⁰ In the process, he converted to Catholicism, joined the Order of Minims at Avignon, and was appointed keeper of Oriental manuscripts at the Vatican library. He "allegedly mastered a knowledge of the Tower of Babel's seventy-two languages" and became the most famous linguist of his age. Greatly admired by his fellow Scots, he served as a model for the "Admirable" Crichton, James VI's former classmate.²⁰¹

Hepburn made Latin translations of many Cabalistic texts, including the *Sepher Yetzirah*, *Keter Malcuth*, and Ibn Ezra's *De Mysticis numeris*, and his expertise won the respect of Casaubon, who was then serving as Henri IV's royal librarian. In the early 1600's, Casaubon asked Hepburn to copy an illustrated Cabalistic manuscript found among the magical collections of Catherine de Medici. The Jewish manuscript drew on the theories of the *Sepher Yetzirah*, *Bahir*, *Merkabah*, Abraham bar Hiyya, and *Zohar*, which were illustrated in a complex sephirotic tree.²⁰² Several of the motifs were of particular Masonic interest, such as the ritual symbols of the building of the Temple (the stone of foundation, divine throne, Jacob's ladder, magical names, etc.). Casaubon informed his correspondents in England about the scroll, and it was subsequently donated to the new Bodleian Library.²⁰³

des Rosencreutzes (Frankfurt, 1616); see Susanna Akerman, "Queen Christina's *Sefer—ha-Raziel* Manuscript," in Allison Coudert, Sarah Hutton, Richard Popkin, and Gordon Weiner, eds., *Judaean-Christian Intellectual Culture in the Seventeenth Century* (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1999), 16.

²⁰⁰ For Hepburn's biography and bibliography, see George Mackenzie, *The Lives and Characters of the Most Eminent Writers of the Scots Nation* (Edinburgh: William Adams, 1708–22), III, 513–18.

²⁰¹ E. Cowan, "Darker Vision," 138.

²⁰² Gabrielle Sed-Rajna, "Un Diagramme Kabbalistique de la Bibliothèque de Gilles de Viterbe," in *Hommage à Georges Vajda* (Louvain, 1980), 365–76.

²⁰³ Desirée Hirst, "The Bodleian Scroll: Hunt. Add.E.R. (Roll): The European Background to Clement Edmondes' Gift to Sir Thomas Bodley for his New Library of a Large Illustrated Scroll of the Kabbalah," in Gunnar Sorelius and Michael

At this time, Casaubon and his friend Joseph Scaliger collaborated with Jan Van der Dreische (Drusius), who taught at Oxford and Leiden and who investigated early Jewish mystical sects. From the research of this scholarly network would emerge several Jewish themes in Freemasonry—themes that would surface in the papers of the royalist Scottish Mason, Sir Robert Moray, in the 1650's. This infusion of Jewish historical and ceremonial lore, which greatly expanded medieval masonic traditions, evidently occurred during the reigns of James I and Charles I, and it provides a foreshadowing of the proliferation of Judaized rites and degrees in the eighteenth century. Thus, a brief look at the scholarly contributors to this Jewish revival will shed some light on later Masonic developments.

As noted earlier, Scaliger had visited Edinburgh in 1566, where he admired Queen Mary Stuart and her Scottish courtiers, whom he praised as "bons philosophes." Inspired by his meeting with Postel, he had learned Hebrew and discussed Jewish mystical and scientific traditions with various rabbis. In Rome and Padua he also witnessed spectacular demonstrations of "the power of artificial memory systems."²⁰⁴ Scaliger's subsequent experiences in Elizabethan London convinced him that the English were mercenary xenophobes. Thus, in 1577 he published a defense of the "Scotobrigantes," defenders of Scotland's ancient independence, in opposition to the English nationalist historians of the Brut school. He even boasted that because of his philological discoveries, "the Scots owe to me this antiquity of their race."²⁰⁵ His prolific writings were studied avidly by James VI and I, who praised "the excellent Scaliger" in 1611—an opinion shared by many Scottish nationalists.²⁰⁶

Scaliger had an important influence on Masonic developments through his studies in ancient architecture and mechanics as well as Hebrew lore, which led to his pioneering work on Jewish artisan guilds and mystical fraternities. While living in Valence in the 1570's, he was impressed by the research into "the material culture of the ancients" undertaken by his house-mate Montjosieu, who became an

Srigley, eds., *Cultural Exchange Between European Nations during the Renaissance* (Uppsala: Academiae Upsaliensis, 1994), 184–92.

²⁰⁴ Anthony Grafton, "Close Encounters of the Learned Kind: Joseph Scaliger's Table Talk," *The American Scholar*, 57 (1988), 586–87.

²⁰⁵ A. Grafton, *Scaliger*, 76–82.

²⁰⁶ James VI and I, *Works*, 366.

expert on the techniques of architecture, painting, and related crafts in antiquity.²⁰⁷ Scaliger combined Montjosieu's archaeological methods with his own philological analyses, while he studied the Biblical and Hebraic accounts of the building of successive Jewish temples. In the process, he concluded that the Jewish sects of Therapeutae and Essenes were religious guilds which were intimately involved in the construction and maintenance of the Second Temple. In 1582 he published *De Emendatione Temporum*, which discussed the relationship of the Jewish Jesus to these sects and then argued that many early Christian rituals were based on Jewish practices. Like Buchanan earlier, Scaliger would provoke much controversy by his claim that the Jewish *Seder* (Passover) was the origin of the Last Supper. He also traced the development of Jewish ceremonial and terminology in the early Christian era, which he viewed as the Israelites' "way to come to terms with the destruction of the Temple and the ensuing transformation of Jewish life."

In 1591 Scaliger took a position at the University of Leiden, and he utilized the Plantin press for publication. While working on problems in ancient geometry, he studied many publications issued by the crypto-Famelist network, especially those by Montano and the Lullists in Spain. At Leiden he worked closely with Drusius, who pursued further investigations into the Essenes, Therapeutae, and their alleged forebears, the Hassidim and Maccabees. In 1604 Drusius published *Tetragrammaton* and in 1605 *De Tribus Sectis Judaeorum*, in which he utilized his extensive Cabalistic learning to argue that the Hassidim-Essenes were a guild of religious craftsmen who played a key role in the development of Jewish mystical traditions of the Temple. When Drusius was attacked by critics, Scaliger came to his defense with *Elenchus et Castigatio anni Gregoriani*, in which he compared the Jewish sect to contemporary artisan guilds ("cum toto corpore Hasidaeorum, quam *Confratrium* vulgo vocant, Teutones inferiores, *Gilde-Broeder*, *Broederschap*").²⁰⁸ In January 1605 Drusius dedicated the second edition of *De Tribus* to James I, who had recently invited Drusius's sixteen year-old son Jean to demonstrate his expertise in Hebrew, Latin, and the Art of Memory before his court.

²⁰⁷ A. Grafton, *Scaliger*, 126, 183, 299–324.

²⁰⁸ In the Huntington Library volume of Drusius's works, Scaliger's defense is bound with Drusius's *Elohim sive de nomine Dei* (Frankerae, 1604).

As James read the publications of Scaliger and Drusius, he perhaps discussed with his Masonic friends the scholars' argument for the role of the Hassidim-Essenes in building the Temple. Moreover, the case for Scottish Masonic links with the ancient Jewish *Gilde-Broeder* may have become part of the oral tradition of the Jacobean lodges. In 1658 at The Hague, the exiled Scottish Mason Robert Moray recommended to a royalist "brother" the works of Drusius for information on Jewish mystical and masonic ceremonies.²⁰⁹ Perhaps Moray drew on oral instructions already included in the Stuart lodges. In 1804, when the Scottish Freemason Alexander Lawrie utilized Scaliger's work to trace the origins of Scottish lodges, he echoed a long-established fraternal tradition:

Scaliger contends, with much appearance of truth, that the Essenes were descended from the Kasideans [Hassidim], who make such a conspicuous figure in the history of the Maccabees [see Scaliger de Emend. Temp.]. The Kasideans were a religious fraternity, or an order of the *Knights of the Temple of Jerusalem*, who bound themselves to adorn the porches of that magnificent structure, and to preserve it from injury and decay [see Scaliger Elench. Trihaer. cap. 22. p. 441]. This association was composed of the greatest men of Israel, who were distinguished for their charitable and peaceful dispositions [see I Maccabees, vii. 13]; and always signalized themselves by their ardent zeal for the purity and preservation of the temple. From these facts it appears, that the Essenes were not only an ancient fraternity, but that they originated from an association of architects, who were connected with the building of Solomon's temple.²¹⁰

Moray's development and dissemination of the thesis of Scaliger and Drusius will be discussed in Chapter Eight but, for now, another argument of the two scholars should be examined—the need for first-hand contact with Jews, in order to understand the roots of Christianity.

Though the Jews were still officially banned from England, James allowed his Biblical scholars to utilize the Hebrew expertise of several resident Jews. This was particularly important to Casaubon, who hoped to resume his Hebrew studies when he answered the king's invitation to live in England. At Oxford Casaubon befriended Jacob

²⁰⁹ See ahead, Chapter Nine.

²¹⁰ Alexander Lawrie, *The History of Freemasonry* (Edinburgh: Alexander Lawrie, 1804), 38. Some Scottish Masons attribute this work to Sir David Brewster.

Barnet, a young Jew who had assisted Richard Kilbye, Regius Professor of Hebrew, and who was now an instructor.²¹¹ Casaubon was so impressed by Barnet's knowledge of Hebrew texts that he carried him off to his house in London in order to benefit from his learning, which he praised to the king. When Barnet returned to Oxford, Casaubon and the youth's patrons expected him to convert to Christianity, and throughout 1613 the latter instructed him in the new faith. However, just before the fatal day, Barnet refused conversion and ran away. The furious proctors sent out search parties in order to arrest him. When the Puritans called for harsh treatment of Barnet, Casaubon appealed to the king, who issued orders on 7 November that the chancellor of Oxford release Barnet and send him to London under "safe custody."²¹² On 16 November James issued a safe conduct for Barnet to be escorted to Dover and sent home by ship.

Given the power of the Puritan party at Oxford, this was the best Casaubon and James could achieve, leading Kilbye to lament:

It will be long before another jew of such attainments comes among us. Had he but put on Christ, what an aid he might have been to Hebrew studies in this place! It is quite impossible for anyone ever to understand the hebrew doctors by his own unassisted efforts, unless he has been first initiated by one of that nation.²¹³

Despite the expulsion of Barnet from the university world, Casaubon continued to correspond with Jews. Like Scaliger, he believed that contacts with "real" (unconverted) Jews were important. He undoubtedly shared these ideas with the king, who frequently invited Casaubon to court for discussions of religious, political, and scholarly subjects. Moreover, James's relative leniency towards Barnet foreshadowed the tolerance towards Jews that would be shown by his Stuart successors.

Casaubon also strengthened the importance of early Jewish mystical traditions, when he used philological methods to correct the dating of the *Hermetica*, which he argued were early Christian forgeries. Yates argues that this exposure "shattered at one blow the build up of Renaissance Neoplatonism with its basis in the *prisca theologi* of

²¹¹ Mark Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon, 1559–1614* (London: Longmans, Green, 1875), 411–12.

²¹² *Acts of the Privy Council of England, 1613–1614* (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1921), 257, 272.

²¹³ M. Pattison, *Casaubon*, 416.

whom Hermes Trismegistus was the chief."²¹⁴ However, Casaubon did not deny the historical existence of Hermes. As Pattison notes, if he expressed a doubt about the *Hermetica*, "it is not on critical grounds, but on the *a priori* improbability that God would not have allowed the Gentiles to have the fuller prevision of the gospel revelation than was granted to the Jews."²¹⁵ Casaubon's revised dating was buried in the abstrusities of his *De rebus sacris ecclesiasticis exercitationes XVI* (1614). Thus, for the few British readers who were aware of his criticism, his re-dating of Hermes only added to the lustre of the more ancient Jewish traditions. When Casaubon dedicated the work to James I, the monarch who was praised as Solomon and Hermes Trismegistus saw no contradiction in his *portmanteau* identity.

During this period, the upsurge of interest in alchemy and Cabala at James's court provoked a satiric response from Ben Jonson, who composed a masque to mock the growing number of "gulls." He acquired the 1570 edition of Euclid which included John Dee's mathematical-architectural preface, but he chose to satirize Dee as a credulous Hermeticist in *The Alchemist* (1610).²¹⁶ Jonson also utilized his fourteenth-century manuscript, "Opus de arte magica," an alchemical work attributed to "Salomon, King of Israel," which he placed in the hands of Sir Epicure Mammon in the comedy. Jonson subsequently acquired *Hermetis Trismegisti Opuscula* (London, 1611), an "anthology of mysticism," and *Malleus Maleficarum* (Lyons, 1615), a collection of "tracts on witchcraft and the occult."

In a new play, *Mercury Vindicated from the Alchemists at Court*, performed before the king in early January 1616, Jonson drew on Sendivogius's satirical *Dialogus Mercurii, Alchymistae et Naturae*, which was usually bound with the Seton-derived *Novum Lumen Chymicum*.²¹⁷ More severe than Sendivogius, Jonson complained about the corrupting power of alchemy, which was spreading infection to all levels of the court. He warned the king that adepts have "got this corner o' the Court to coozen in, where they sharke for a hungry diet below staires, and cheat upon your under-Officers, promising mountaines

²¹⁴ F. Yates, *Bruno*, 398.

²¹⁵ M. Pattison, *Casaubon*, 2nd ed. (1992), footnote to *Exercitt.* I, 10. See also, Anthony Grafton, "Protestant versus Prophet: Isaac Casaubon on Hermes Trismegistus," *JWCI*, 46 (1983), 78-90.

²¹⁶ D. McPherson, "Jonson's Library," 43, 50, 64, 84.

²¹⁷ S. Linden, "Jonson and Sendivogius," 39-54.

for their meat, and all upon *Mercuries* security." As the Hermetic trickster Mercury tries to fend off "a troupe of threadbare Alchymists," he appeals to the king, "the *Sol* and *Jupiter* of this spheare" to protect him against "the sooty Tribe here; for in your favour onely, I growe recover'd and warme." The need for the king to exert control over the alchemists was reinforced by Jonson's charge that even members of the court guard have illusions of prolonging their lives indefinitely through a magical elixir.

Jonson, who would later mock the Rosicrucians, may already have heard of their manifestos and of the interest of Scottish courtiers such as Maxwell, Erskine, and Kerr in their claims. With Arthur Dee now serving the queen, Jonson would certainly have been concerned at the publication of a new defense of the Rosicrucians by an Englishman, who also dedicated a Hermetic work to the king. In 1616 the London-based physician Robert Fludd utilized the former Plantin press, now run by Godfrey Basson, to print his *Apologia Compendiaria Fraternitatem de Rosea Cruce* at Leiden. Fludd enthusiastically praised the agenda of the *Fama* and *Confessio*, while he rejected Libavius's charge that the brothers were wickedly magical and seditious.²¹⁸ Fludd also expressed his ardent desire to be allowed to join the Rosicrucian fraternity. In 1617 Fludd issued the *Tractatus Apologeticus Integritatem Societatis de Rosea Crucis* (same press), in order to defend white magic, especially the mathematical-mechanical and Cabalistic-angelic forms of the art. He interpreted the Rosicrucian manifestos as a call for reform of the practical sciences, especially in mathematics, medicine, and alchemy.

In the same year, Fludd published the first volume of *Utriusque Cosmi* (Oppenheim: De Bry, 1617), an elaborately illustrated Hermetic-Cabalistic history of the macrocosm, which he dedicated to God and King James. According to Fludd, some "Envious persons" at court warned James that an author who defended the seditious Rosicrucians had dared to dedicate a work to him. James therefore invited Fludd to a personal audience, where he questioned him and then pronounced himself satisfied with Fludd's ideas.²¹⁹ James also requested that Fludd write a defense of his work, the "Declaratio Brevis," and he became a generous patron to the physician and experimenter.

²¹⁸ F. Yates, *Rosicrucian*, 75–77.

²¹⁹ William Huffman, *Robert Fludd and the End of the Renaissance* (London: Routledge, 1988), 36–38.

Because eighteenth-century Masons would claim that Fludd later merged Rosicrucianism into Freemasonry, it will be useful to examine his activities and their possible impact on "the craft."

Fludd studied at Oxford in the 1590's, where he read widely in Hermetic and Cabalistic works and prepared himself as a Paracelsan physician. He then travelled for six years on the Continent, where he developed his Lullist expertise. His visit to Spain, where the Familist cell at the Escorial continued their Lullist studies, suggests his access to that "pre-Masonic" tradition. In Marseilles in 1602, he instructed the Duc de Guise and his brother, a Knight of Malta, in mathematics and the "secret military arts."²²⁰ In Avignon he wrote a treatise on geomancy, and in Rome he studied mathematics, mechanics, and magnetism. Given his interests, he probably contacted Hepburn in Avignon and the Macolo brothers in Florence. The Macolos, who practised Paracelsan medicine and directed a Lullist society, would later be characterized as "followers of Robert Fludd."²²¹ Fludd then travelled in Germany, where he possibly met the various alchemists who would launch the Rosicrucian movement. After his return to England, he developed a prosperous medical practice and close friendships with Sir William Paddy, the king's physician, and with Dr. William Harvey, discoverer of the circulation of the blood.

It was perhaps through Paddy that Fludd met Michael Maier, who presented a copy of *Arcana arcanissima* (1614) to Paddy. Though it has long been assumed that Fludd and Maier became friends and collaborators, Ashmole noted that Maier was not well treated in England ("to our shame be it spoken, his Entertainment was too course for so deserving a Scholler").²²² Though Maier may have carried Fludd's manuscript, *Utriusque Cosmi*, to the printer De Bry in Oppenheim, he subsequently expressed his disapproval of certain statements by Fludd. On 17 April 1618 Maier wrote to the Landgrave Moritz of Hesse-Cassel:

I perceive that the author [Fludd] is very insolent in his censure of nations . . . making the Germans (who share in the Empire and are

²²⁰ Ibid., 13, 30.

²²¹ Michela Pereira, "Medicina in the Alchemical Writings Attributed to Raimund Lull (14th-17th Centuries)," in Piyo Rattansi and Antonio Clericuzio, eds., *Alchemy and Chemistry in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1994), 7.

²²² E. Ashmole, *Theatrum Chemicum*, [ii].

truly in command of things) idle, negligent and slow, whereas he portrays the English (which astonishes me) as magnanimous, reckless, intrepid, etc.: indeed I would like to give those immature censors a taste of that whip, if nobody should dissuade me, and show them who, of that sort and importance the Germans are.²²³

In his *Declaratio Brevis* for James I, Fludd mentioned his disagreement with the carrier of his manuscript, who wanted to dedicate it to his prince, the Landgrave of Hesse, rather than the British king. As Figala and Neumann point out, there are several possible candidates for the courier and dedicatee, and there is “no hint that Maier knew the author of the offensive remarks personally.” Maier was so annoyed at Fludd’s English boasting that he composed *Verum Inventum* as “a sort of response to the derogatory allegations of Fludd and others about the Holy [Roman] Empire.”²²⁴

Heisler suggests that there was another German courier who took Fludd’s first apologies for the Rosicrucians to their Leiden publisher. In his defense before James, Fludd mentioned the admiration of his work expressed by Johann Bayer, a doctor of law in Augsburg, who was in London and friendly with Fludd in 1614–16.²²⁵ Heisler also notes that Bayer admired the work of John Napier and encouraged the publication of a German translation of Napier’s treatise on logarithms at Strasbourg in 1618. He then observes, “The prospect of a Fludd link with Napier is alluring.” Though it is unknown if Fludd knew John Napier, who died in 1617, he did have contacts with John’s nephew Richard, who owned many papers of John Dee and Simon Forman (the latter’s were passed on to Fludd). He may also have known John’s favorite son and executor Robert Napier, who participated with his cousin Richard and Fludd in the alchemical circle hosted by John Thornborough, Bishop of Worcester.²²⁶ Like Fludd, Robert Napier would be characterized as a Rosicrucian.

The Napiers and Fludd combined their studies in the Hermetic sciences with practical pursuits in metallurgy, mathematics, and architecture. In Fludd’s defense to King James, he echoed the determination of John Napier to improve the expertise of artisans and craftsmen: “my Apology, defending the Brothers of the Rosy Cross . . . first of

²²³ Karin Figala and U. Neumann, “Bio-bibliography of M. Maier,” in P. Rattansi, *Alchemy and Chemistry*, 132–35.

²²⁴ According to K. Figala; quoted in Heisler, “Fludd,” 148.

²²⁵ R. Heisler, “Fludd,” 140–41.

²²⁶ B. Moran, *Fludd*, 32–33; W. Huffman, “Fludd’s ‘Declaratio,’” 70.

all pertains particularly to the impediments of the Arts, which are in a state of decline, and the method of reviving them." He wanted to show "certain modest truths and things that are useful to our country." Fludd advised James to read through the lives of the most distinguished philosophers and physicians (especially Pythagoras, Plato, and Hermes Trismegistus), who travelled in search of wisdom:

... all of them, for the sake of learning and erudition and to become participants in the mysteries of the divine philosophy, made long and laborious journeys through almost all of the learned world, in the manner of pilgrims, for the purpose of visiting the wise men of Ethiopia, examining the mysteries of the Egyptian High Priests, and for pursuing the enigmas of the hieroglyphics as well as the secrets of the inscriptions and carvings on the Pyramids of Memphis . . .²²⁷

While linking the travels of Christian Rosencreutz to those of previous philosophers, Fludd reminded James of the latter's publicly expressed attitude towards good magic—"the honorable and lawful inquiry into the mysteries of nature has as yet by no age ever been prohibited or interdicted for the Philosopher and Physician."

James's sympathetic response to Fludd and his extension of royal patronage suggests that he read and approved of Fludd's books on the macrocosm and microcosm. Among the king's Masonic courtiers, Fludd's defense of the Egyptian-Hebraic "hieroglyphic" traditions and his discussions of mathematics, geometry, and the military arts were relevant to their own interests. Perhaps the most pertinent section was Fludd's discussion of the Art of Memory, which he presented in a highly architectural framework. Unlike the more theoretical writers on Memory, Fludd advocated the use of "real places in real buildings" for mnemonic practice.²²⁸ He had long been interested in the masonic crafts, and he may have learned of the importance of Memory to the training of Scottish masons.

It was no coincidence that Fludd acquired a 1616 edition of Palladio's *I quattro libri dell'architettura*, as well as a 1616 edition of Aaron Rathborne's *The Surveyor*.²²⁹ Rathborne dedicated his geometrical treatise to Prince Charles, who was portrayed as a practising mathematician with compass in hand. While stressing the importance of

²²⁷ Ibid., 83.

²²⁸ F. Yates, *Art of Memory*, 328.

²²⁹ W. Huffman, *Fludd*, 231.

mathematical studies to “due consideration of that sacred and mysticall *Unitie* and *Trinitie*,” Rathborne gave practical instruction in geometrical measurements.²³⁰ Fludd’s emphasis on the architectural method of the Art of Memory occurred in a context of masonic revival in London, and he may have passed on his Rosicrucian enthusiasm to Inigo Jones, who later referred to his conversations with Fludd.²³¹

In January 1615 King James praised Charles Martel, the traditional hero of operative masonry, for valiantly defeating the Saracens.²³² He also implied an identification between Martel and the Scottish family of Stewarts, for Martel “ruled the Kingdome under the title of *Steward* of the King’s house, the principall Officer of the Crown.” James drew further on Josephus, whose works provided much of the masons’ traditional lore. On 16 July 1615 he issued “A Proclamation for Buildings,” in which he described himself as an historically unprecedented patron of architectural reform:

We doe well perceive in Our Princely wisdom and providence, now, that Our Citie of London is become the greatest, or next the greatest Citie of the Christian world . . . Wee doe exceedingly approve and commend all Edifices, Structures, and workes which tend to publique use and ornament . . . which have bene erected and performed in greater number in these twelve yeeres of Our Reigne, then in whole ages heretofore . . .²³³

In September 1615 James was finally able to fulfill a wish he had expressed earlier, when he appointed Inigo Jones as Surveyor of the King’s Works. James had granted to Jones the reversion of the surveyorship (to succeed Simon Basil on his retirement) on 27 April 1613.²³⁴ It seems likely that the king then encouraged Jones to join Arundel in his journey to Italy, for the express purpose of studying architecture and masonry. After a nineteen-month residence in Italy, Jones was now prepared to become the William Schaw of England. He had carefully studied the architecture of Palladio and his pupil Scamozzi, who advocated a revival of Vitruvian principles. The

²³⁰ Aaron Rathborne, *The Surveyor* (London: W. Stansby, 1616), preface.

²³¹ V. Hart, *Art and Magic*, 80.

²³² In “A Remonstrance for the Right of Kings”; see James VI, *Works*, 404.

²³³ James F. Larkin and Paugh Hughes, eds., *Stuart Royal Proclamations* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1973), 345–46.

²³⁴ *CSP. Domestic, James I*, IX, 27.

Palladianism that Jones and Arundel transplanted to England was "one of the last expressions of Renaissance humanism in Italy," as Parry explains:

It emphasised the supreme importance of symmetry and the harmony of proportions, proportions that were related on the one hand to the ideal dimensions of the human figure, and on the other to the fundamental mathematical ratios established both by the division of the musical scale and by the spacing of the planets, so that a Palladian building represented a statement in stone of basic cosmic harmonies related to the human frame . . . Palladio, like other Renaissance architects before him, mixed antiquarian research and revival with a philosophical argument justifying architecture as the supreme union of the arts and sciences, a revelation (to the initiated) of platonic ideas ordered into a formal structure by mathematical discipline.²³⁵

On 20 June 1616 James gave his first address in the Star Chamber, where he recounted his double apprenticeship as a Pythagorean king.²³⁶ He further drew on Mosaic, Davidic, and Solomonian precedents of kingship to argue his power over judges. Echoing his recent proclamation on buildings, in which he abhorred divisive principles that provoke religious wars and murders of kings, he defended his merciful treatment of politically loyal Catholics as part of his agenda for improving the architecture and city planning of England. However, he was still frustrated by delays in rebuilding St. Paul's cathedral and, given the stubborn opposition of Parliament, he must have appreciated the support he received from a private citizen, Henry Farley, who published *The Complaint of Paules, to all Christian Soules* in 1616. In his supplication to James, Farley noted that all foreign visitors praise the king as "A Second Solomon," while his land is "Israel that flowes with milke,/ And honey."²³⁷ English churchmen should never say "that they did grudge the *Temple* to maintaine." Farley then dreamed of being an architect who could visualize the re-built church and country, "an Israel anew."

As Puritan opposition continued to thwart Farley's dream and James's policy, the "Rosicrucian" James Maxwell added his argument to the call for improvement of ecclesiastical architecture, decoration, and ceremonial. In *A New Eight-Fold Probation of the Church of England's*

²³⁵ G. Parry, *Golden Age*, 111.

²³⁶ James VI and I, *Political Works*, 326-44.

²³⁷ Henry Farley, *The Complaint of Paules* (London: C. Legge, 1616). 28, 29, 67.

Divine Constitution (1617), dedicated to “James the Concorder,” Maxwell utilized masonic imagery to preface his work:

I have brought unto the building of the spirituell Temple of Concord and Peace, two stones, two treatises penned and framed to the common people’s capacitie . . . as the beloved and divine man of God MOSES made the Tabernacle according to the patterne or modele shewed him in the mount . . .²³⁸

He then called upon churchmen and Parliament to live up to the standards of their Jewish forebears, who followed the precedent of Maccabeus in establishing religious ornament and ritual for the Temple.

James’s English courtiers would soon have an opportunity to learn about Scottish Masonic traditions, for the king vowed to fulfill his often-delayed promise to visit his homeland. According to Anderson, James’s attempt to implement a Masonic revival in England would be strengthened by his servants’ experiences in Scotland:

. . . the Lodges there [were] kept up without Interruption many hundred Years, the Records and Traditions of which testify the great Respect of those [Scottish] Kings to this honourable Fraternity . . . Nor was the royal Example neglected by the Nobility, Gentry, and Clergy of Scotland, who join’d in every thing for the good of the Craft and Brotherhood . . .²³⁹

However, the transfer of Scottish Masonic traditions to the south would be fraught with more problems than Anderson admitted into his blithe account. In 1617, as well as in 1723, the union of England and Scotland was threatened by nationalistic rivalries and religious polarizations.

²³⁸ James Maxwell, *A New Eight-Fold Probation* (London: Legatt, 1617), preface, 37–38.

²³⁹ J. Anderson, *Constitutions* (1723), 37.

CHAPTER SIX

“THE JUDGEMENT OF SOLOMON”: THE UNFINISHED TEMPLE OF PEACE AND CONCORD (1616–1625)

But though all true Masons honour the Memories of those Italian Architects, it must be own'd that the Augustan Stile was not reviv'd by an crown'd Head, before King James the Sixth of Scotland, and First of England, patroniz'd the said glorious Inigo Jones, whom he employ'd to build his Royal Palace of White-Hall; and in his Reign over all Great-Britain, the Banqueting-House, the first piece of it was only rais'd . . .

—James Anderson, *Constitutions of the Freemasons* (1723)

According to Anderson, the “mighty Genius” of Inigo Jones “pre-vail'd with the Nobility and Gentry of all Britain, (for he was as much honour'd in Scotland as in England).”¹ However, when Anderson credited Jones with single-handedly reviving “the ancient Stile of Masonry, too long neglected,” he ignored the long survival of that style in the northern kingdom. Moreover, the revival in England owed much to the contacts with Scottish Freemasonry made by the king's English courtiers and servants during the royal visit to Scotland in 1617. While the Scots outdid the English in their praise of the British Solomon, they also reminded James of their stubborn independence in the face of English intrusion. For Scottish masons, their ancient traditions were still linked with nationalistic and European developments, which would eventually place them at odds with the king's Anglicized policies.

In spring 1616, as James and his courtiers labored to implement their architectural agenda, the king's old friend Dunfermline visited London to report on affairs in Scotland. While serving as chancellor, Dunfermline worked closely with John Napier, who dedicated a new mathematical treatise, *Rabdologiae*, to his friend.² Napier's work

¹ J. Anderson, *Constitutions* (1723), 40.

² The work was written in 1615 but published in 1617.

aimed at simplifying mathematical procedures by utilizing little rods made of bone or ivory (called “Napier’s Bones”). The new method would improve the ability of craftsmen to utilize mathematics in their labor. Napier probably shared Dunfermline’s concern at the deterioration in expertise and behavior of the masons and artisans in Edinburgh, where an excess of wine imports led to widespread drinking and neglect of work.³ By imposing a tax on wine, Dunfermline hoped to reform the craftsmen and pursue the architectural agenda so important to himself and the king. Dunfermline’s effort may have inspired James’s similar determination to tear down alehouses in London, which he featured as part of his reform of building practices.

When Dunfermline returned to Scotland in April 1616, he brought news of James’s plan to visit his homeland the next year—a visit that would reinforce his image as a “Mason King.” In May Dunfermline and his nephew George Seton (Third Earl of Winton) worked with the Privy Council to pass an act empowering James Murray, Master of Works, to repair the royal palaces in anticipation of James’s visit. However, the chancellor soon learned that the royal visit had a religious agenda that provoked resistance among the more radical Presbyterians. In the name of British religious and political harmony, the king planned to reinforce Episcopalianism and introduce Anglican services into Scotland. To prepare Holyrood Chapel for this momentous occasion, James ordered Inigo Jones to organize the shipment of “chapel pictures and furniture” to Edinburgh. As hostile rumors circulated about Papist artistic innovations, Seton became frustrated by his inability to find expert or cooperative Scottish carvers and masons for work at Holyrood. In August he reported to the Council that the king’s command to repair and refurnish the chapel could not be “gottin so perfytlie and well done within this cuntrey as is requisite.”⁴

Thus, the Council agreed to employ Nicholas Stone, “carvair, citienair of Lundone” to carry out the renovation. Stone was the son of a quarryman and had served an apprenticeship under Hendrik de Keyser, master mason to the city of Amsterdam, who became Stone’s father-in-law. After returning to London in 1613, Stone assisted Jones and gained a reputation as a talented monumental

³ Maurice Lee, *Government by Pen: Scotland Under James VI and I* (Urbana: Illinois UP, 1980), 129.

⁴ *Register of Privy Council of Scotland (1613–16)*, 1st series, X, 517, 593.

sculptor. When he arrived in Edinburgh in July 1616, he became the intimate friend of Sir David Cunningham, son of the former Master of Works, who evidently recommended him for work on Holyrood Palace.⁵ Stevenson suggests that Cunningham *filis* was a Freemason who would later help organize a secret fraternity among Scottish courtiers in London.⁶ During Stone's residence in the north, he worked on other buildings where he met talented local masons (such as William Wallace, employed as a carver at Edinburgh Castle).⁷ His experience with operative and gentleman members of the Scottish fraternity would later prove significant, when several Scottish Masonic traditions were transmitted to London.

Unfortunately, the appointment of an English mason as overseer at Holyrood provoked further Presbyterian opposition. On 28 August 1616 the lords Dunfermline, Winton, and Perth took legal action against some slaters and other craftsmen of St. Andrews for refusing service in his majesty's works at Edinburgh. When they ordered the provost of St. Andrews (the aptly named John Knox) to compel the artisans to work, the provost "disdainfully answered that it was not the custom of the country to press any man to [serve]."⁸ As noted earlier, the English custom of impressing masons had long been associated with military aggression against Scotland. Thus, Knox's response reflected patriotic as well as Presbyterian concerns. Nevertheless, Seton chastized Knox that because of the craftsmen's actions, "his Majesty's works are hindered, and by their misbehaviour others may take occasion to leave his Majesty's service." Though many masons were enthusiastic about the impending royal visit, others continued to resist the summons to work on alleged Papist projects. In February 1617 two masons of Culross were ordered to leave their private work and join their fellow craftsmen at Holyrood or Dunfermline. In March, as the visit loomed closer, five masons of St. Andrews were ordered to assist at Holyrood, despite their earlier disobedience of a summons. Finally, on 17 March, the Council issued a warrant to pay Matthew Goodrick, "painter and citizen of London," for painting and gilding the chapel.

⁵ Alfred Bullock, *Some Sculptured Works by Nicholas Stone* (London: B.T. Batsford, 1908), 18–19.

⁶ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 186–87.

⁷ H. Colvin, *Biog. Dict.* 1018.

⁸ *Reg. Privy. Council. Scot.*, 1st s., X, 607; XI, 39–40, 63, 65.

From the first announcement of his homeward journey, James was enthusiastic about his proposed visit, and he likened his desire to that of a salmon who yearns to return to the place of its birth. However, he was soon irritated by a plethora of obstacles—especially the reluctance of many English courtiers to accompany him to the “barbarous” north.⁹ Parliament grouched at the expense of the journey, and his critics complained in December 1616 that “the Scotch journey is still talked of.”¹⁰ While Jones in London and Stone in Edinburgh tried to fulfill the king’s orders for Holyrood, Jones lamented that “money is wanted” for the task. In March 1617, just prior to setting out, James was reminded of the continuing barriers to his attempted architectural reform. Henry Farley presented him with a poem in which he urged the royal “Peacemaker” to remember St. Paul’s, for its deteriorated state was still the shame of English Protestantism.¹¹

When James progressed northward, he visited Lincoln and York, where he admired the great Gothic cathedrals. Crossing the border into Scotland, he was greeted by orations in Hebrew, Latin, and Greek that emphasized his role as the Solomonic builder of the Temple of Peace.¹² James stopped first at Castle Douglas and then at Seton Palace, where he was the guest of Winton, who shared the enthusiasm for architecture of his uncle Dunfermline. Having repaired Seton Palace, the earl was currently working with William Wallace on plans for Winton Castle, which would feature elaborately carved unionist royal symbolism and which became “the choicest example of Renaissance architecture in the East Lothian.”¹³ Wallace’s expertise was praised to the king, who named him master mason to the Scottish Crown on 18 April. As noted earlier, Winton’s father had been close to Alexander Dickson and William Schaw, at a time when the latter emphasized the importance of the Art of Memory in the training of masons. Much of the decorative detail in Seton family architecture suggests the infusion of “mnemonic” symbolism and design.

⁹ On the English view of Scots as barbarians, see Jenny Wormald, “James VI and I: Two Kings or One?”, *History*, 68 (1983), 190–93.

¹⁰ *CSP. Domestic, James I*, IX, 412.

¹¹ The 1617 poem appears in Henry Farley, *St. Pauls-Church Her Bill for the Parliament* (London, 1621).

¹² David H. Willson, *King James VI and I* (New York: Holt, 1956), 390–91.

¹³ B.G. Seton, *House of Seton*, 181, 189; D. Howard, *Scottish Architecture*, 212.

A fellow-guest at Seton Palace was the poet William Drummond of Hawthornden, who welcomed James home in a lively panegyric, *Forth Feasting*, in which the rivers of Scotland join together to greet their peace-making king.¹⁴ From his grandfather Robert Drummond of Carnock, a talented architect and predecessor of Schaw as Master of Works, William inherited an interest in architecture, which he shared with the Setons and his close neighbors, the St. Clairs of Roslin.¹⁵ In fact, his fantastic mansion at Hawthornden—carved of stone and perched on the edge of a precipice—was often linked with Roslin Castle, which was built two miles up the same gorge. Drummond drew on Scottish traditions about the importance of rocks and hewn stone in a speech he prepared for James's arrival at the west gate of Edinburgh: "If Nature could suffer Rocks to move and abandon their natural places, this Town, founded on the strength of Rocks . . . had with her Castles, Temples, and Houses moved towards you."¹⁶

Drummond was also fascinated by the Art of Memory, which he must have learned as a youth at the court of James VI. His father John Drummond was a favorite courtier there, and his uncle was William Fowler, who taught Memory to the king. In 1604 the king sent John Drummond on a mission to Spain, where he could have learned about the Lullist architects and scholars at the Escorial. William Drummond was close to his uncle Fowler (died 1614), who bequeathed him his books and manuscripts, including the treatise on Memory. Probably encouraged by his father and uncle, William acquired rare copies of Lull's *Ars Magna* (1507), Arnold de Villa Nova's *De arte cognoscendi*, Agrippa's *Commentarius in artem brevem Lullianum* (1545), Dickson's *Thamus* (1597), and Bruno's *Summa Terminorum Metaphisicorum* (1609).¹⁷ Because Drummond's poetry was admired by the royal family and the Scottish courtiers in London, his fascination with the Lullist Art of Memory becomes relevant to the infusion of

¹⁴ John Adamson, ed., *The Muses Welcome to the High and Mightie Prince James* (Edinburgh: Thomas Finlaison, 1618), 17, 25–37. Drummond's poem is placed with those presented at Seton Palace.

¹⁵ David Masson, *Drummond of Hawthornden* (London: Macmillan, 1873), 2–6.

¹⁶ William Drummond of Hawthornden, *The History of Scotland*, 2nd ed., introd. Mr. Hall (London: T. Fabian, 1682), 359.

¹⁷ Robert H. Macdonald, *The Library of Drummond of Hawthornden* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1971).

Scottish Masonic themes into England. As will be shown, he was probably a “gentleman” Mason himself.

Masson points out that Drummond’s emanationist philosophy of “the All” was “a definite visual cosmology” which utilized the “optical imagination.”¹⁸ In “An Hymne of the Nature, Attributes, and Workes of God,” Drummond used his mind as a “labouring Ingine” to methodically achieve the intense visualization that renders visible the invisible powers. At such moments, Drummond employed architectural imagery—“Alls Architect, Lord of the Universe,/Wit is ingulph’d that would thy greatnesse pierce.” In “A Cypress Grove,” a prose meditation on his visionary process, Drummond described how “those Images were limned in my minde,” when he went into a semi-waking “trance in which the Minde awaking is carried with free wings from our fleshlie bondage.” Through visual meditation, the poet was carried through the spheres until he saw the celestial palaces and “that glorious Temple.” When a man raises himself through contemplation to “that first illuminating Intelligence,” he imitates “the Artes-maister of this Universe” and becomes “an immediate Master-piece of that great Maker.” In another poem, “Contemplation of Invisible Excellencies Above, By the Visible Below,” Drummond praised “the Architect of this great Round,” who did “frame/This Pallace visible.”

Much of Drummond’s philosophical writing echoed the techniques and imagery of the *Sepher Yetzirah* and *Merkabah* mysticism, as well as those of Lull and Bruno. That he knew Hebrew and owned at least eleven Hebrew books means that he probably recognized the Jewish roots of the Christian Art of Memory. He was perhaps also aware of references to these Jewish traditions in the secret oral instruction of Scottish Freemasonry. Like his St. Clair neighbors and local masons, Drummond combined his Lullist and Hebrew interests with studies in mathematics and mechanics. From his youth, he had been interested in John Napier’s works, especially his mathematical-prophetic treatise on the apocalypse, and he became a confidante of the mathematician.¹⁹ In a long list of military and mechanical inventions that Drummond later presented to Charles I, he carried on Napier’s agenda of scientific experimentation, design, and model-making. James was impressed by Drummond, and he probably told Ben Jonson

¹⁸ D. Masson, *Drummond*, 71.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 156–62.

about the Scottish *savant*, for Jonson subsequently sought out Drummond when the king sent him to Scotland in 1618–19.

While still at Seton or in Edinburgh, the king met Drummond's friend and correspondent, David Lindsay (later First Earl of Balcarres), whose father John Lindsay (Lord Menmuir) had earlier served James at his Scottish court. Because of Menmuir's expertise in mathematics, mechanics, and metallurgy, he had been consulted by Schaw in 1596 about repair work on the king's palaces.²⁰ Menmuir's son David Lindsay carried on his father's scholarly and scientific interests, which he pursued during five years of study on the Continent.²¹ David returned to Scotland and married Sophia Seton, daughter of Dunfermline, in 1612. He then devoted himself to study and experimentation in chemistry, alchemy, and the occult sciences, while he maintained contacts with Hermeticists abroad. Dunfermline shared his son-in-law's esoteric interests, and he would acquire Rosicrucian works by 1625.²² Lindsay, in turn, would later transcribe the Scots English translation of the *Fama* copied by his friend George Erskine from Robert Kerr's manuscript.²³ The Seton-Lindsay-Kerr family connection marks an early link between Rosicrucianism and Freemasonry, and their descendants would later influence the development of Freemasonry under Charles I and Charles II.²⁴

When James moved on to Edinburgh, his journey was eased by the repairs to roads and bridges made by local masons and workers under the direction of the chancellor and Privy Council. Arriving in the city, the king moved into the newly remodelled Edinburgh Castle, which featured the outstanding work of twenty-four stonemasons, under the direction of Master of Works Murray and master mason Wallace. The architects and craftsmen were especially proud of the smooth ashlar masonry and ornate carvings. As Howard observes, the returning monarch must have been struck by the careful symmetry of each façade and the fine quality of the stonework:

²⁰ National Library of Scotland: Personal Papers from the Muniments of the Earl of Crawford and Balcarres—ACC 9769. MS.12/5/19 (Dunfermline, Schaw to Menmuir, October 1596).

²¹ Ibid., MS.14/8/1–2. David Lindsay's notebook and astronomical treatise of 1603 reveal his skill in mathematics and wide reading in classical authors.

²² Ibid., ACC.9769. MS.14/2/2. Handwritten catalogue of books of Earl of Dunfermline at Pinkie (1625).

²³ A. McLean "Manuscript Sources."

²⁴ A. Lindsay, *Lives of Lindsays*, I, 202–23; see ahead Chapter 8.

... but the palace was not all discipline and restraint. On the east side, facing the town were three great oriel windows, each three stories high, separated by heraldic panels. Although the half-moon battery gave some protection, the huge oriels on the accessible east side of the castle glorified the new confidence of James's position. They were prominently visible from the town below, and offered panoramic views from the royal apartments . . . As at Dunfermline Palace, castellation now conveyed courtly chivalry and the historical roots of the monarchy, instead of military strength.²⁵

The impressive work on Edinburgh Castle proved the wisdom of James's elevation of Murray from artisan to gentleman class (he became a land-owning laird in 1612). The social mobility within Freemasonry allowed a former wright to create a new Scottish "court style, a bookish classicism infused with Flemish-style Mannerist ornament."²⁶

Also staying in Edinburgh Castle were three English nobles who shared James's architectural ambitions for his southern kingdom. William Herbert, First Earl of Pembroke, had been appointed by James to his building commissions, and he employed Inigo Jones for private work. Also serving on the building commissions and patronizing Jones was Arundel, whose erudite study of architecture included the technical elements involved in quarrying and hewing stones (he was said to love stone so much that he fondled it). In many ways, Arundel was an artistic and religious soul-mate of Dunfermline. Both were private Catholics who appeared sympathetic to Anglicanism, and both supported the king's architectural agenda in the face of hostile resistance from iconoclastic radicals. James's new favorite, George Villiers, Marquis of Buckingham, developed an enduring interest in architecture, and he made a number of good friends among the Scottish lords.²⁷ That Pembroke, Arundel, and Buckingham, accompanied by Dunfermline, had opportunities for observing Scottish Freemasonry in action would be significant when they returned to London, where Inigo Jones would attempt to reform English masonry.

In company with the king, the English courtiers met various gentleman or "speculative" Masons who worked with operative masons. When the royal party visited Culross, they were entertained at "The

²⁵ D. Howard, *Scottish Architecture*, 38.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 212.

²⁷ Roger Lockyer, *Buckingham: The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham, 1592-1628* (London: Longman's, 1981), 32, 213-15, 409-11.

Palace," a stone mansion built by Sir George Bruce in 1597. Expecting a visit from James VI at that time, Bruce directed his craftsmen to paint esoteric "devices," whose hidden meanings he knew the king would enjoy deciphering.²⁸ The artists drew on Bruce's volume of *A Choice of Emblemes* (1586), by Geffrey Whitney, published by the Plantin press and featuring the suggestive emblem of hand with compass. Twenty years later, Bruce had another allegorical picture waiting for the king. According to local tradition, the symbolic wall painting of "The Judgement of Solomon" was commissioned by Bruce in honor of the king's return visit. Moreover, the face of King Solomon was reportedly that of King James. Baigent argues that Bruce was a Freemason, who was involved in both the operative craft as the builder of the "Palace" and in the speculative rituals that infused Cabalistic and Hermetic mysticism into the lodges.²⁹ As noted earlier, painters in Scotland had long been included in the Incorporation of Masons and Wrights, and they maintained a close relationship. James also descended the stone-built shaft of Bruce's undersea coal mine, which revealed the technological and engineering skills of the local masons.

The king and his party had additional opportunities to meet operative and speculative Freemasons. While they were at Stirling Castle, James invited the professors of the University of Edinburgh to participate in a disputation on theological and scientific topics. John Adamson was asked to preside, and James was so pleased with the academic performance that he declared, "These men know Aristotle's mind as well as himself while he lived."³⁰ Through this occasion, James and his English courtiers made contact with an important Masonic family. John Adamson was a native of Perth, and when the king moved on to that ancient city, he met the professor's father James Adamson, who had served as Dean of Guild during an earlier royal visit in 1602. According to the Perth Corporation records, at that time Adamson *père* appointed a Master of Work for the Tay bridge.

More importantly, the king now met his other son, the poet Henry Adamson, "student in divine and human learning," who presented

²⁸ M. Airs, *Buildings*, 17.

²⁹ M. Baigent, "Painting," 154-71.

³⁰ On James's contact with the Adamson family and the Perth Freemasons, see T. Marshall, *History*, 488-94.

him with panegyric verses.³¹ The masons of Perth later affirmed that James VI and I maintained “during all his lifetime” membership in the Lodge of Scone.³² Thus, it is significant that Henry would write *The Muses Threnodie*, which explicitly linked Rosicrucianism to Freemasonry. Henry’s maternal uncle and intellectual companion was Henry Anderson, who delivered a Latin eulogy to welcome the king to Perth. Anderson had studied in Italy, where he developed an enthusiasm for Renaissance architecture and Hermetic learning. Henry Adamson participated in a network of amateur scholars and antiquarians, who were devoted to Scotland’s ancient architectural and literary traditions. Though his “Masonic” poem will be fully analyzed in the next chapter, certain passages refer to the period of James’s visit to Perth in 1617—and they shed new light on the king’s Solomonic-Masonic endeavors when he returned to England.

A year before his visit to Scotland, James had exhorted the English Parliament and craftsmen to perform the charitable act of building and repairing bridges, which was traditionally considered a moral obligation for masons in Scotland. When he first entered Scotland in May, he was presented with a poem by Alexander Craig in which his peaceful unification of the kingdoms was compared to the pacifying linkage of “famose Perth’s faire Bridge.”³³ When James arrived in Perth on 5 July, he saw the “charitable” masons in action, for the talented master mason John Mylne was then completing an eleven-arched stone bridge over the Tay. The king greatly admired Mylne’s work, and he would later issue an appeal for the bridge’s repair after a devastating flood. Henry Adamson, who recalled his grandfather’s tales of the European masons who helped build the great charterhouse of Perth, described Mylne’s new bridge in terms that suggest his own participation as a speculative Mason in an operative lodge.

After Adamson and his companion John Gall examined the bridge, the poet recalled its intricacy and beauty, which served as an emblem of divine architecture:

When we these heaven-like arches had survey’d,
We admir’d in th’air these hinging stones what stay’d;

³¹ J. Adamson, *Muses Welcome*, 156.

³² R. Mylne, *Master Masons*, 128–29.

³³ J. Adamson, *Muses Welcome*, 99.

Then thus, said Gall, these on their centers stay,
 As on their bases fixt, and all their sway
 They press toward the same—a wondrous thing,
 Albeit the centre in the air doth hing;
 Yea, divers circles, sections divers ways,
 Tend to their proper centres, as their stays;
 So these two sections do conjoine in one
 To make the arch, and finished in a cone;
 As everie peace these bowing arches bends,
 It rightly pointing to the centre tends:
 So heavens respect the earth, and all their powers,
 Together in her bosome strongly powvres,
 Which is their center, roote, and sure pedestall—
 The steadfast base whereon this world doth rest all:
 Thus man's ingine God's works doth imitate,
 And skilfull art doth nature emulate;
 As Archimedes in a sphere of glasse
 The world's great fabrick lively did expresse,
 With all the stars fixt in the azure heaven,
 And all the motions of the planets seven,
 Moving about a fixed point or center,
 Observing houres, dayes, monthes, summer and winter,
 Even so the arches of this bridge proclaime,
 And shew the building of the starrie frame . . .³⁴

In an epitaph for John Mylne, probably composed by Henry Adamson, the poet linked the master mason's vision with that of the architect of the Escorial. The verse was engraved on Mylne's tomb in Greyfriars Church after his death in 1621:

This stone entombs the dust of famous Mill,
 Renowned chiefly in his time for skill
 In architecture, his learned art did lay
 The spacious arches of the bridge of Tay . . .

 To Master Mill, whose squirbuily [capacious] braine
 Could ten Escurialls containe
 While he breathed life . . .³⁵

Adamson and presumably Mylne were well versed in Vitruvian principles, which the poet merged into older Hebraic traditions. That Scottish masons were also familiar with the architecture of the Escorial is significant.

³⁴ Ibid., 60–61.

³⁵ T. Marshall, *History*, 540; D. Stevenson, *First Freemasons*, 104.

When Adamson linked “second sight” to Rosicrucianism and Freemasonry, he may have drawn on the Lullist Art of Memory, which was utilized in the design and construction of the Escorial—and which Schaw required in the training of Scottish masons. That Schaw possibly visited Spain during his architectural pilgrimage is relevant to the revival (or survival) of architectural Lullism in Scotland. When Adamson referred to the great Gothic buildings of Scotland’s past, he seemed to describe the meditative art of visualization that made the Lullist Art so important to architects and masons. Praising Edinburgh’s high-perched castle and towering stone houses (“palaces so mounted in the air”), Adamson proclaimed that “if the deepness of imagination/ Could limn a land-scape by deep meditation,” scarce could it match the city’s wise counsellors and brave youths who developed and defended the city.³⁶

At Perth James was also reminded of the founding myth of Gathelus and Scota when John Stewart praised “the ancient nation of the Scots, descended of the victorious Greeks and learned Aegyptians,” who had maintained the kingdom’s independence for over two thousand years under the government of one hundred and seven kings, from Fergus onwards.³⁷ The English courtiers were perhaps amused by the poet’s implication that their founding hero Brut was merely a defeated Trojan. More importantly, Stewart linked the Egyptian heritage to James’s Hebraic role—“in spirituell disposition, a faithfull David . . . ane other Salomon, for your heavenlie wisdom in governing Gods kirk.” Stewart then led the citizens of Perth in huzzahs, like “the citizens of Jerusalem, who gave a shout to the heaven for joy of King David his returne home unto the citie after his long absence.” Among the English visitors to Perth was William Laud, the learned Anglican churchman, who was perhaps inspired by the masonic accomplishments and Solomonic tributes of the local citizens. Upon his return to England, James appointed Laud to the deanship of Gloucester, where he replaced the Puritan bishop who “had tolerated dilapidation in the cathedral fabric.”³⁸ As we shall see, Laud’s subsequent sermons extolled the Solomonic wisdom of masonic building projects—in phrases that often echoed the orations of Perth.

³⁶ H. Adamson, *Muses Threnodie*, 24.

³⁷ T. Marshall, *History*, 126–30.

³⁸ D. Willson, *James VI and I*, 211.

One Scottish churchman who took Laud seriously was John Spottiswoode, archbishop of St. Andrews, who determined to build a Gothic-style parish church in Fife as "a visual protest against Presbyterian austerity."³⁹ Spottiswoode recorded that he "publicly and upon his own charges built and adorned the church of Darsy after the English form." He later boasted that it was "one of the beautifullest little pieces of church work that is left to that now unhappy country," which had been ravaged by "the boisterous hand of a mad Reformation." Howard notes that the church was an eclectic gem, featuring imaginative design and exquisite stonemasonry. Spottiswoode's efforts for the king's ecclesiastical and architectural policies would earn him royal favor over the next decades.

King James greatly enjoyed his visit to his native kingdom, and he planned to return in the near future. Soon after his arrival in London in September 1617, he urged Ben Jonson to visit Scotland and to collect information on Scottish history and antiquities for a proposed publication.⁴⁰ James was distressed to learn that one of his English courtiers, Sir Anthony Weldon, who had accompanied him on the northern journey, wrote a scurrilous account of the Scots which was discovered among his official papers. Portraying James's countrymen as filthy, fetid, fanatical, and Frenchified, Weldon expressed the stereotyped view maintained by many Englishmen:

... every whore in Houndsditch is an Helena ... in comparison to these [Scottish gentlewomen]; and therefore to conclude. The men of old did no more wonder, that the great Messias should be born in so poor a town as Bethlem, in Judea, then I do wonder that so brave a prince as King James should be born in so stinking a town as Edenburg, in lousy Scotland.⁴¹

Though Weldon was removed from his position, he was granted financial compensation and a pension. James seemed to believe that mild treatment and a counter-educational effort would be better policy.⁴² Thus, Ben Jonson's study tour of Scotland and projected publication would be important in moderating English xenophobia.

³⁹ D. Howard, *Scottish Architecture*, 188-90.

⁴⁰ R.F. Patterson, ed., *Ben Jonson's Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden* (New York: Haskell House, 1974), xv.

⁴¹ *A Perfect Description of the People and Country of Scotland* (London, 1659); reprinted in W. Scott, *Secret History*, II, 89.

⁴² Over the next decades, the disgruntled Weldon recorded hostile anecdotes and

During Jonson's six months in Scotland (July 1618–January 1619), he became the confidante of William Drummond and spent several weeks at Hawthornden. Though Jonson revealed to Drummond that his own grandfather (Johnston) came from Scotland, his genial host was not impressed by what he perceived as Jonson's English chauvinism.⁴³ Nevertheless, Drummond listened attentively to Jonson's literary and political gossip, and his record of their conversations provides rare information on Shakespeare, Bacon, Donne, and a host of Jacobean figures. Drummond assisted Jonson in gathering emblems and impresa of Scottish notables, including those of Mary Queen of Scots, and information on Scottish chivalric traditions.⁴⁴ He also helped his English guest collect information on the government of Edinburgh, with its traditional structure of burgesses, incorporations, and guilds. On 20 September 1618 Jonson was admitted as "a burges and gildbrother in communi forma" in the city, and he may have learned about the unique relationship between the masonic lodges and the incorporations, which had been worked out by Schaw.⁴⁵ As Stevenson explains,

... through lodges the masons asserted their right to their own autonomous organizations, established by themselves without seal of cause or other authorisation from outside the craft. In such lodges they could seek to regulate their craft without intervention by others, and develop their own secret legends and rituals.⁴⁶

Could Drummond have informed Jonson about the connection of "second sight" with Scottish masonic lore? Certainly, they discussed the phenomenon, which Jonson claimed to have experienced when he "saw in a vision his eldest sone . . . appear to him with the mark of a bloodie crosse on his forehead" and then learned of the simultaneous death of the boy.⁴⁷ They also discussed the works of Cardano, who wrote extensively on Lullist versions of "second sight" and whose description of a floating island on Lake Lomond had long fascinated

rumors about James that were posthumously published by a Cromwellian. Despite its many distortions and inaccuracies, *The Court and Character of King James* (1650) had an enormous, enduring influence on Whig historians of the reign.

⁴³ R. Patterson, *Jonson's Conversations*, 56.

⁴⁴ D. Masson, *Drummond*, 110.

⁴⁵ Ben Jonson, *Ben Jonson*, eds. C.H. Herford and Percy Simpson (Oxford: Clarendon, 1925–63), I, 78.

⁴⁶ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 40.

⁴⁷ R. Patterson, *Jonson's Conversations*, 25.

Jonson. The two poets differed, however, in their valuation of the "masonic" poet Du Bartas, whom Drummond admired and Jonson scorned—especially because of Du Bartas's realistic descriptions ("he wrote not fiction"). As noted earlier, these non-fictions included a great deal of practical masonic and architectural detail. Jonson owned James's translations from Du Bartas, and he knew how much the king revered the French poet.⁴⁸ But he was so jealous of the high claims of the Vitruvian architect that he characterised Inigo Jones as "the greatest villain in the world"—an accusation that must have surprised Drummond, for Jones was greatly admired in Scotland. Perhaps Jonson referred to the growing rift between himself as Vitruvian poet and Jones as Vitruvian mason when he sketched for Drummond his personal impresa—a defective compass with one foot in the center, the other broken, with the Latin motto *Deest quod duceret orbem* ("that which should make up the circle is lacking").⁴⁹

Unfortunately, Drummond did not record any discussion of Francesco Colonna's *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* (1499), but it seems likely that the subject would have arisen, for the work interested both poets. Colonna presented a highly eroticized and mystical vision of the importance of architecture and stonemasonry which was relevant to their on-going conversations. Many Francophile Scots were familiar with the elegant French translation, *Le Songe de Poliphile* (1546), attributed to an anonymous Knight of Malta, with added illustrations which influenced French architecture and decorative art. Drummond owned the greatly condensed English translation, *Hypnerotomachia: the Strife of Love in a Dreame* (1590), and he was probably aware of the work's influence on the fantastic "Garden of the Planets" created by Sir David Lindsay at Edzell Castle in 1604.⁵⁰ Surrounded by walls designed according to "sacred geometry" and built by local masons, the garden was decorated with "pilasters, pediments, Stuart unionist royal symbols and carved panels depicting the planetary deities, the Virtues and the Arts."⁵¹ Symbolising "the builder's character, education and good fortune," the garden was a testament of Lindsay's

⁴⁸ D. Macpherson, "Jonson's Library," 55.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 57.

⁵⁰ Adam McLean, ed., *The Hypnerotomachia or Dream of Poliphilus* (Glasgow: Magnus Opus Hermetic Sourceworks, 1986), vii–viii. I am grateful to Joscelyn Godwin for alerting me to McLean's introduction.

⁵¹ M. Glendinning, *History*, 59.

esoteric, architectural, and civic beliefs.⁵² While Gent concludes that Colonna's work had no influence on architecture in Elizabethan England because of the deficiency in architectural taste at the time, she seems unaware of its impact on garden design and stone carving in Jacobean Scotland.⁵³

However, Gent does notice the influence of *Hypnerotomachia* on Scottish poetry, especially Sonnet 1 and Song 1 in Drummond's *Poems* of 1616. Jonson studied Drummond's volume in 1617, which may have inspired him to acquire his lavishly illustrated, complete Italian edition of Colonna's work, produced by the Aldine press in 1545.⁵⁴ Since 1600, Italian and French editors claimed that Colonna concealed alchemical secrets in his text, and their deciphering of *Hypnerotomachia* subsequently influenced "the emblematic and allegorical stream of ideas that emerged in the Hermetic tradition at that time, and appeared more openly in the court masques and allegorical dramas."⁵⁵ As a script writer for Stuart court masques, Jonson would have found these emblems and images provocative. Unlike Drummond, however, he would have been irritated by Colonna's panegyrics to the Vitruvian architect. Through intense meditation on the design and construction of spectacular stone buildings and monuments, the narrator Poliphili achieves a state of visionary ecstasy:

After looking at this so intently and concentratedly, my senses were captivated and stupefied by an excess of pleasure that excluded every other joy or comfort from the grasp of my memory. As I marvelled at it and examined carefully every part of the beautiful complex . . . my emotions were suddenly so warmly aroused that I gave forth a sobbing sigh.

As my loud, amorous sighs resounded . . . I was reminded of my divine and immeasurably desirable Polia . . . this amorous and celestial ideal . . .⁵⁶

⁵² M. Airs, *Buildings*, 65–66.

⁵³ Francesco Colonna, *Hypnerotomachia: The Strife of Love in a Dream* (1592), trans. R.D., introd. Lucy Gent (Delmar, New York: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1973), vi, xvi.

⁵⁴ Jonson's edition is in the British Library. Though most of the excessive annotations are in another hand, he evidently translated some of the technical terms and underlined important passages. See D. Macpherson, "Jonson's Library," 38.

⁵⁵ A. McLean, *Hypnerotomachia*, ii.

⁵⁶ Francesco Colonna, *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili: The Strife of Love in a Dream*, trans. Joscelyn Godwin (London: Thames and Hudson, 1999), 30–31.

Colonna seemed aware of Hebrew traditions of Solomonic architecture, for he referred to "the great skills . . . of Jewish Hiram," "the brazen lions in the temple of the wise Jew," and the rites of "the holy Jew," while he included two inscriptions in Hebrew letters.⁵⁷ His linking of meditation on architecture with the achievement of a mystical-erotic trance further suggests his familiarity with Cabalistic techniques, which he seemed to merge into the Art of Memory. For Scottish architectural enthusiasts like Lindsay and Drummond, his descriptions of the operative and speculative masonry embodied in actual Vitruvian and early Renaissance edifices were relevant to their own projects. In the English translation by R.D. (Richard Dallington?), Poliphili describes his visualization or "conceiving capacity":

. . . the notable disposition and order of Architecture, the durable Symmetrie and proportion of the building, perfect and absolute, the noblenes of the Art of Masonrie and Lapycidarie, the directions and placing of Columnnes, the perfection of statues and representations, the adornment of the walles, the diversitie of the stones, the stately entrance & princely porch . . . In which conceiving capacitie, marvellous performance, incredible charge, and high commendation of the most excellent Artificer . . . I also beheld . . .⁵⁸

Colonna repeatedly praised the "subtiltie of the art of *Lapicidarie*," and it is suggestive that R.D.'s use of the word "lapicide" would be translated as "a stone-cutter or Free-Mason" in a 1656 English glossary.⁵⁹ The art historian Blunt was puzzled by seventeenth-century commentators who referred to "cachées . . . qu'il n'est licite reveler" in Colonna's architectural descriptions, but contemporary initiates of the masonic fraternity or *compagnonnage* would have recognized many esoteric references.⁶⁰ The brother of Sir David Lindsay of Edzell was Lord Menmuir, who had collaborated with William Schaw and John Napier; thus, it is possible that Schaw and Napier were also familiar with Colonna's architectural-masonic allegory. Drummond was close to the Lindsay, Napier, Seton, and Alexander families, who all had Masonic connections. Thus, the emergence of a mystical-architectural eroticism in the Masonic correspondence of Robert Moray

⁵⁷ Ibid., x, 33, 39, 67, 135.

⁵⁸ F. Colonna, *Hypnerotomachia*, trans. R.D., 62–63.

⁵⁹ "Lapicide," *Oxford English Dictionary*.

⁶⁰ Anthony Blunt, "The Hypnerotomachia Poliphili in Seventeenth-century France," *JWCI*, 1 (1937), 123–24.

in the 1650's may reflect a "hypnerotomachian" influence on the esoteric teachings of Scottish Freemasonry.

The narrator Poliphilus also relates his discovery of "an everlasting Lampe," which reveals mysterious hieroglyphs on the walls of "feareful vaultes, and subterranean buttresses" which sustain "the waightie *Pyramides*."⁶¹ The parallels with the Rosicrucian *Fama*, in which an architect discovers a similar lamp and vault, raises the question of whether the authors of the latter tract were familiar with Colonna's work. McLean argues for a direct influence, especially on Andreae's *Die Chymische Hochzeit Christiani Rosencreutz* (1616), and he suggests further that David Lindsay's garden had "distinct Rosicrucian connections."⁶² Certainly, Lindsay had travelled in Germany, from where he invited various German metallurgists and engineers to "search for the planetary metals" buried at Edzell. From these German contacts, he may have learned about the proto-Rosicrucian works of Simon Studion and other Hermetic millenarians.⁶³ His brother Menmuir collaborated with the German metallurgists, and Menmuir's son David Lindsay would subsequently develop Rosicrucian contacts and translate works about the fraternity. As First Earl of Balcarres, the latter Lindsay would become father-in-law to Robert Moray, and both men would play important roles in the development of Freemasonry.

Of course, all of these mystically grandiose claims for architecture further annoyed Ben Jonson, who was increasingly envious of Inigo Jones. In Jonson's full edition of the *Hypnerotomachia*, he read that the ordering and original invention "is assigned to men of rare talent," and the architect should be "a man of universal curiosity."⁶⁴ The reverent student of architecture could also participate in secret mystical rites, held in a sacred college, in which he "penetrates" the veil covering the "sacred majesty of the Goddess" who "resided voluptuously in the centre of the fountain." The erotic goddess seemed to combine the *Shekinah* of the Cabalists with the "divine Venus" and Isis of Greek and Egyptian mystery religions. The illustrations of a stone carving of "the ithyphallic symbol" and of satyrs with erect phalluses, which expressed the erotic rapture of Poliphili's archi-

⁶¹ F. Colonna, *Hypnerotomachia*, trans. R.D., 57, 67.

⁶² A. McLean, *Hypnerotomachia*, vii; see also his article, "A Rosicrucian/Alchemical Mystery Centre in Scotland," *HJ*, 4 (1979), 11-13.

⁶³ M. Glendinning, *History*, 59.

⁶⁴ F. Colonna, *Hypnerotomachia*, trans. Godwin, 43, 73, 195, 363.

tectural meditation, would later influence Jonson's satire on Inigo Jones as "In-and-In Medlay," who has sexual congress with his wooden construction.

When Jonson returned to London in April 1619, he reported to James on his researches in the north. The king urged him to write on the history and customs of Scotland, and Jonson asked Drummond to send him relevant information. Thus, he probably showed James his copy of "the oath which the old valiant knights of Scotland gave when they received the order of knighthood; which was done with great solemnity and magnificence." Drummond procured this from "the Herald Drysdale" and sent it to Jonson in May.⁶⁵ At this time, James initiated a reform of the Order of the Garter, which inspired Edmund Bolton to propose to Buckingham that a select group of Garter knights should establish a Royal Academy at Windsor Castle, which would be "encorporated under the tytle of a brotherhood or fraternitie."⁶⁶ Though the academy remained in the planning stages, the king explored additional ways to regenerate the Garter.

James expressed to Jonson his admiration for Tasso's *Jerusalem Delivered*, and he recognized that the kings of France and Spain still sponsored military orders of chivalry, whose initiation rites included catechistical questioning, fastings, ritual bathings, religious instruction, and solemn oaths.⁶⁷ While he and Inigo Jones launched their ambitious architectural program, they may have infused chivalric elements into Freemasonry as part of their reformist agenda. As we shall see, the evolving proposals for the Royal Academy, with its Garter links, gradually added mathematical, mechanical, and architectural studies to the agenda. Hart observes that "institutions of chivalry were naturally linked to those of the crafts," with "the lore of each laying claim to having either spiritually or physically built the temple in Jerusalem."⁶⁸

This possible linkage of Garter and Masonic reform is further suggested by a tract written in June 1619 by Patrick Scot, a Scottish propagandist for James's religious policies. Dedicated to the king, Scot's *Omnibus and Singulis* clearly linked Solomonic, masonic, and

⁶⁵ R. Patterson, *Jonson's Conversations*, xv-xvi.

⁶⁶ D. Dickson, *Tessera*, 8.

⁶⁷ See St. Palaye, *Memoirs of Ancient Chivalry* (London: J. Dodsley, 1784), 22, 44, 53-55.

⁶⁸ V. Hart, *Art and Magic*, 78.

chivalric themes. He characterized James as King David and Prince Charles as his Solomonic heir. He predicted that Charles would govern “your Israel” according to the solid foundation laid by his father. Scot stressed the importance of meditation, and he discussed the emanation of “divine names” according to Dionysius the Areopagite. He then recalled taking a chivalric oath as part of his apprenticeship: “I formerly swore my loyal service with my hand in a steel gauntlet,” and “I have made choice rather to expose my Apprentice-like skill in the structure of such an architect.”⁶⁹ As noted earlier, the role of the gauntlet or steel glove in the initiation ceremony for a knight possibly influenced the role of leather gloves in masonic initiation. In 1737 an English critic of Freemasonry would claim that Scottish (Jacobite) Masons preserved a secret “knightly” military tradition:

There seems likewise to be something emblematical in the *Gloves* and *Aprons*; a *Glove* is only another Word for a *Gauntlet*, which is a *Piece of Armour* for the *Hands*. An *Apron*, indeed, is a proper badge of *Masonry*, in the literal sense; but it is likewise a Term in *Gunnery* for a _____ Piece of Lead to cover the *Touch* _____ of a *Cannon*, when it is loaded.⁷⁰

Patrick Scot, who successfully sought James’s patronage, was aware of the king’s renewed Solomonic agenda which was stimulated by his Spanish marriage project for Prince Charles. Conscious of the great achievements of Spain’s Lullist architects, especially at the Escorial, James determined to equal or surpass the buildings of his future in-laws. Having recently observed the outstanding architectural achievement of John Mylne, the Perth master mason whose ingenious brain could contain ten Escorials, James perhaps drew on Scottish masonic traditions to reform the organization and training of masons in London.

In 1618 Nicholas Cure (the king’s Flemish master mason) carved an epitaph for the tomb of “John Stone, Freemason,” which suggests an infusion of Scottish traditions of Solomonic-Hebraic masonry:

On our great *corner Stone*
This Stone relied
For blessing to his building
loving most

⁶⁹ Patrick Scot, *Omnibus and Singuls* (London: William Stansby, 1619), preface.

⁷⁰ Letter from “Jakín,” in *Gentleman’s Magazine*, VII (April 1737), 226–28.

to build *God's Temples*
of the Holy Ghost
in whose lov'd life is proved
and Honest Fame
God can of *Stones*
raise seed to *Abraham*.⁷¹

John Stone was kinned to Nicholas Stone, who had worked with Scottish masons on royalist projects in Edinburgh. While there, Nicholas knew Sir William Alexander, who had recently published lines similar to Cure's in his religious epic, *Doomes-Day* (1617): "*America to Europe may succeed,/God may of stones raise up to Abram seed.*" As Williamson observes, Alexander hoped that the pure religion (Judeo-Scottish) of the Caledonian colonists sent to America "might redeem a hardened and corrupted Europe."⁷²

In November 1618 James named Bacon, Pembroke, and Arundel to direct a commission on buildings, and he encouraged Jones to expand his architectural agenda. According to Anderson, the king approved the masons' choice of Pembroke as Grand Master in December.⁷³ Pembroke in turn appointed Jones as his Deputy Grand Master. Anderson claimed to glean this information from a manuscript history of Freemasonry written by Nicholas Stone. Then, in January 1619, when fire destroyed the Banqueting House at Whitehall, James and Jones gained an opportunity to introduce a new style of royalist building to England—one that merged Villalpando's Solomonic vision with Jones's Palladian design.⁷⁴ The new Banqueting House would express permanently in stone the essence of Stuart monarchy. Parry observes that the importance of the Banqueting House in Stuart affairs cannot be overstated:

It was then the very nucleus of royal activity; what St. Paul's and the Houses of Parliament were to Church and State, so the Banqueting House was to Monarchy . . . it was the King's hall of state, his audience chamber and his place of judgement; the masques were held here, as that other ceremony that testified to the King's divinity, the Service of Healing . . . The Banqueting House would definitively establish James as . . . a Solomon presiding in judgement; it would be a

⁷¹ W.J. Williams, "Use of Word," 255.

⁷² See A. Williamson, "Jewish Dimension," 11.

⁷³ J. Anderson, *Constitutions* (1723), 99.

⁷⁴ Roy Strong, *Britannia Triumphans: Inigo Jones, Rubens, and Whitehall Palace* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1980), 55–64.

symbol of his peace and of the harmony of his rule, and it would be the Temple of the Stuart Kings.⁷⁵

However, the Banqueting House was to be only the first step in the massive reconstruction of Whitehall Palace, which would be turned into a new Temple of Solomon, based upon but transcending “the symbolic geometry of the Escorial.”⁷⁶ James and Prince Charles studied Villalpando’s exposition, and Jones’s designs reveal his own familiarity with its Lullist principles and mystical geometry. That the king was now served by two Scottish masters of the Lullist science—John and James Macolo—means that Jones and his masons had access to their peculiar expertise. Of great importance to this architectural revolution was a masonic revolution made possible by Jones’s discovery in 1619 of the Portland quarries, which produced a hard stone suitable for the building styles of Scotland and Europe. It was probably Nicholas Stone, recently returned from Edinburgh, who informed Jones about the quarries, for his father-in-law Hendrik de Keyser owned some of them and made Portland stone part of his daughter’s dowry.⁷⁷ Jones now appointed Stone to serve as his master mason, and the craftsman would soon prove capable of implementing the Surveyor’s ambitious vision for the Banqueting House.

The emergence in 1619 of records for the Masons’ Company of London—“the best early evidence of institutionalized masonic initiation of some sort in England”—was probably connected with the need to train local masons to work on the new stone.⁷⁸ In 1618–19 the “free mason and workman” of Lincolns Inn Chapel had proven so deficient that the chapel was badly built and needed constant repairs.⁷⁹ If Pembroke really served as Grand Master, he could have learned from his own employees about the low standards among London’s operative masons. Pembroke’s Master of Horse, Francis Osborne, recorded his own and the local masons’ scorn for Arundel’s great collection of Greek sculpture. Osborne ridiculed “the Earle of Arundell” for giving “so many hundred crownes for an urne, a mason would not have valu’d at a penny.”⁸⁰ Thus, the return of Nicholas

⁷⁵ G. Parry, *Golden Age*, 153.

⁷⁶ R. Strong, *Britannia Triumphans*, 61.

⁷⁷ Walter Spiers, ed., *The Notebook and Account Book of Nicholas Stone*. Walpole Society, vol. 7 (Oxford, 1919), 2–3.

⁷⁸ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 217.

⁷⁹ J. Alfred Gotch, *Inigo Jones* (London: Methuen, 1928), 120–21.

⁸⁰ Francis Osborne, *Traditional Memoires of the Raigne of King James the First*; rpt. in

Stone, who was a talented sculptor and admirer of classical art, was an important step in James's and Jones's plan to improve the education and expertise of English masons. Moreover, Stone had probably been initiated into Scottish Freemasonry and could infuse certain northern traditions into the London Masons' Company.

Though Jones and Stone may have hoped to implement a Schaw-type reformation of the Masons' Company, they ran into resistance from some craftsmen. Stevenson points out that in London only a minority of masters were "accepted" or "made," and that the accepted masons formed an exclusive cell within the London Company.⁸¹ In the rare surviving minute book (from 1 July 1619 to July 1620), it is clear that the Company now included speculative Freemasons who were not members of the operative craft.⁸² Perhaps Jones and Stone selected masons more amenable to the king's architectural agenda and imitated the Scottish tradition of recruiting gentlemen or speculative members to reinforce their loyalty. This would lend credibility to Anderson's claim that Pembroke served as Grand Master and that "many eminent, wealthy and learned Men, at their own Request were accepted as Brothers, to the Honour of the Craft."⁸³

At this time, the king formed a special "Commission for the Banqueting House," composed of "right trustie and right welbeloved Cosins and Counsellors."⁸⁴ Joining Pembroke were Arundel and Lennox, who had also been in Scotland. Perhaps these selected commissioners were made "accepted" masons in the London Company, for they "embodied what we today would call the building programme." It was probably Stone who instigated the Scottish-style amalgamation of marblers or sculptor-masons into the Company, which evidently took place during this period.⁸⁵ Stone's sculptured marble tombs resembled the small architectural models or "essays" (featuring roofs, pediments, colonnades, etc.) that apprentice masons

W. Scott, *Secret History*, I, 199. Both Pembroke and Osborne would abandon Charles I and serve Parliament during the Civil War.

⁸¹ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 234.

⁸² Edward Conder, *Records of the Hole Crafte and Fellowship of Masons*, eds. Louis Williams and Robin Carr (1894; facs. rpt. Bloomington: Masonic Book Club, 1988), 139-41.

⁸³ J. Anderson, *Constitutions* (1738), 99.

⁸⁴ Per Palme, *Triumph of Peace: A Study of the Whitehall Banqueting House* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1957), 53-58.

⁸⁵ E. Conder, *Hole Craft*, 70.

had to construct.⁸⁶ In 1619 Stone recorded that he made a sun dial for King James, who provided the proper stone for it, and he would later collaborate with John Marr, the Scottish mathematician, to construct a famous dial for Whitehall.⁸⁷ Though some Scottish traditions were introduced into London masonry, there seemed to be a limit on the degrees of initiation (one instead of two) and on access to the esoteric lore of the craft. Perhaps nationalistic Scottish masons were reluctant to divulge all their secret traditions to Englishmen or to suspected “Papist” builders. Nevertheless, with Stone serving James as master mason, there was now a direct link between the Stuart court and the London Masons’ Company.

In 1620 James’s antiquarian interest in architecture led to an unusual commission for Inigo Jones, whom the king asked to study the ruins at Stonehenge and report back with his interpretation. Influenced (and biased) by his Vitruvianism, Jones developed an inaccurate theory about the Roman origin and symbolic geometry of Stonehenge. According to his measurements, the ground plan formed by an inner hexagon of stones inside a great circle yielded “the significant geometry of four equilateral triangles inscribed within a circle, a figure which he declared appeared in Vitruvius as a plan for a temple.”⁸⁸ Jones also noted that “the Magi adde that a triangle of equal sides is a symbol of Divinitie, or sign of celestiall matters.” He concluded that the geometrical components of the scheme—circle, triangle, hexagon—all had astrological affinities. Hart argues that Jones’s interpretation was influenced by Dee as well as Vitruvius.⁸⁹ Responding to theories about the method of construction at Stonehenge, Jones observed that they wonder by what means such huge stones were set up: “What may be effected by that Mechanicall Art, which Dee in his Mathematicall Preface to Euclide, calls Menadry, or Art of ordering Engines for raising weights.” Hart further suggests that Jones’s temple plan was “akin to contemporary memory systems,” and that by a final jump of the imagination in his design process, the architect perceived Stonehenge as “an analogue of Solomon’s temple.”

⁸⁶ A. Bullock, *Some Sculptural Works*, 30.

⁸⁷ W. Spiers, *Notebook*, 49.

⁸⁸ G. Parry, *Golden Age*, 156.

⁸⁹ V. Hart, *Art and Magic*, 129–34.

During the same period when the king received Jones's report on Vitruvian-Solomonic Stonehenge, he determined to revive their plans for rebuilding St. Paul's in order to have a worthy national church to represent Anglicanism and to show off to foreigners. Henry Farley had appealed to James, when he returned "From Edinburgh to our Jerusalem," to remember the needed repairs for St. Paul's church and steeple.⁹⁰ Jones now transferred his Stonehenge theories to his plans to restore St. Paul's as a Solomonic Temple of Memory and Wisdom. Among the king's appointees to the committee for restoring the cathedral was Fulke Greville, who had earlier heard Bruno mock the dilapidation of the Anglican mother church. James and the committee soon learned that their campaign would not be easy. On 26 March 1620 the king made a festive progress through London to St. Paul's Cross where, before a large assembly that included the Masons' Company of London, he announced his plans to restore the crumbling cathedral.⁹¹ James then kneeled at the west door and listened to Bishop King preach on a text from Psalm 102 (chosen by the king): "Thou shalt arise and have mercy on Sion . . . thy servants think upon her stones; and it pitieth them to see her in the dust."⁹² The king was moved to say that, "if need be, he would fast on bread and water to see the work done." When the London Freemasons sent in their estimate for the cost of Portland stone, James and Prince Charles headed a national subscription and donated large personal sums. However, from other quarters, little money came in to the fund.

Like Chancellor Dunfermline and the Privy Council in Scotland, James and his building commission faced Puritan as well as Presbyterian resistance to their architectural efforts. While in Edinburgh, James knighted Sir Archibald Napier and appointed him to the Privy Council. Eldest son and heir to the late John Napier, Archibald carried on his father's technological inventiveness, while he oversaw much of the masonic repair work in the kingdom.⁹³ Napier worked closely with James Murray, Master of Works, while the latter struggled to diminish the influence of radical Presbyterians on the craftsmen. Similarly in London, Jones sought support from Privy Council

⁹⁰ H. Farley, *St. Pauls Church*.

⁹¹ E. Conder, *Hole Craft*, 147.

⁹² H. Colvin, *History*, II, 148.

⁹³ *Reg. Privy. Council. Scot.*, 1st s., XI, 214n.1, 275; XIII, 705-07.

members who served on the building commission, as he struggled with recalcitrant workers. On 16 August 1620 Jones complained to the commission: "Many masons employed on the Banqueting House, Whitehall, have run away, and others will do so, unless there be some punishment inflicted."⁹⁴ He then gave the names of five ring-leaders of the rebellious craftsmen.

Even worse was the situation at St. Paul's. When the Building Commission ordered that illegal edifices encroaching on the church must be torn down, there was much resistance. On 17 August Jones wrote to Arundel to complain about the deficient skills and poor work habits of many local masons:

The plan of all the incroachments about Paules is fully finished. I heear that the masons do begin to mak up that part of the east end w'ch they have demolished, not well—but with uneven courses of stone. I am now going to the mr. of the wardes, to tell him of itt . . .

. . . After my departure from London, many of the masons went away wth'out leave, but since, some ar retorned; and, for the rest, yf your lo'p do shew sum exemplary punishment causing the' to be sent up as malyfactors, it will detter the rest fro' ever doing the lyke.

The Banqueting-house goith on now well, though the going of the masons away have byne a great henderance to it.⁹⁵

Sharing the frustration of James and Jones, Farley issued new appeals for St. Paul's—this time making explicit masonic allusions. In *St. Paules-Church, Her Bill for the Parliament* (1621), Farley argued:

Never had any Church more need of Reparation and Reformation; for every day shee consumeth, and every base fellow pisseth against her doores and defileth her walles . . . (who should be the only She for Beauty and Example) . . . Her West doore, and Brazen Pillar, where his Maiestie kneeled, and prayed for good successe to his Pious intendment for her restauration, is the most odiously and ignominiously abused . . .⁹⁶

Farley compared James's effort to "purge the land and the Temple" with that of King Josiah who, also in the eighteenth year of his reign, purged the Temple of heresie and corruption. Urging Parliament to read three relevant chapters in the Old Testament, Farley made clear the growing significance of masonic endeavor for the king and his Master of Works.

⁹⁴ CSP. Domestic, James I, X, 172.

⁹⁵ J. Gotch, *Jones*, 123–24.

⁹⁶ Henry Farley, *St. Paules-Church Her Bill for the Parliament* (London, 1621), [i–ii].

In *II Kings*, chapter 22, Josiah (a son of King David) ordered the priests to deliver monies that they had collected into the hand of the doers of the work, that have the oversight of the house of the Lord, "to repair the breaches of the house. Unto carpenters, and builders, and masons, and to buy timber and hewn stone to repair the house." In *II Chronicles*, chapter 34, the story is repeated, with even more emphasis on the importance of providing sufficient funds to the Master of Works and his craftsmen:

Even to the artificers and builders gave they it, to buy hewn stone, and timber for couplings, and to floor the houses which the kings of Judah had destroyed.

And the men did the work faithfully . . . And the king stood in the place, and made a covenant before the Lord.

In *I Kings*, chapter 5, the central myth of Freemasonry is elaborated, when Solomon requests the aid of Hiram, king of Tyre, in procuring hewn stones and cedar timbers for building the great Temple of Jerusalem:

And Solomon had threescore and ten thousand that bare burdens, and fourscore thousand hewers in the mountains;

Beside the chief of Solomon's officers which were over the work, three thousand and three hundred, which ruled over the people that wrought in the work.

And the king commanded, and they brought great stones, costly stones, and hewed stones, to lay the foundation of the house.

And Solomon's builders and Hiram's builders did hew them, and the stonesquarers; so they prepared timber and stones to build the house.

Farley then specifically identified James with Solomon, who worked closely with the architect Hiram and his craftsmen.

Farley's exhortation to Parliament was followed by a remarkable sermon preached at court by William Laud, dean of Gloucester. As noted earlier, Laud had accompanied James to Scotland and shared his architectural ambitions. Like the king and prince, Laud was inspired by Villalpando's reconstruction of the Temple of Jerusalem according to Vitruvian principles. On James's birthday, 19 June 1621, Laud took as his text Psalm 122:6-7:

Pray for the peace of Jerusalem; let them prosper that love thee. Peace be within thy walls, and prosperity within thy palaces. For my brethren and companions' sake, I will now say, Peace be within thee.

The sermon would certainly have appealed to the brethren and companions of the Masons' Company, who would see themselves in the "*virī-muri*, men-walls" described by Laud.

He called upon church builders to stand as towers and pillars in Jerusalem, the "*domicilium religionis*, the house of religion, as well as *regni*, of the kingdom." Like the ancient Jews, they must "re-edify the ruins of both City and Temple." They must reject the parsimonious iconoclasm of Puritans and Chiliasts:

... many children of the substantial Church have showed themselves base and unnatural. "Palaces?" no, cottages are good enough; as if it were a part of religion, that Christ and His priests must have less honour in the substance, than they had in the ceremony. And yet, when I consider better, I begin to think it is fit the priest's house should be mean, where the Church, which is God's house, is let lie so basely:—for, "he that hewed timber afore out of the thick trees, was known to bring it to an excellent work; but now they have beaten down all the carved work thereof with axes and hammers."⁹⁷

Perhaps in a nod to Scottish Masonic traditions of "second sight," Laud assured the builders that David possessed that visionary and prophetic gift, which enabled him to "foresee" in the architectural design of the Tabernacle that of the future Solomonic Temple and even the Christian Temple.

Though Laud aimed to recall the recalcitrant masons to their Solomonic duty, he also hoped to move certain reluctant courtiers to see the linkage between the royal building program, religious unification within Great Britain, and the policy of reconciliation with Spain. Responding to a radical Puritan tract, *The Calling of the Jews: A Present to Judah and the Children of Israel* (1621), which linked anti-monarchical with anti-Papist themes, Laud criticized those schismatics in religion who violate the Judeo-Christian traditions of Anglican Protestantism. Through their attacks on the man-walls, pillars, and columns of the Temple, they unwittingly served the ends of manipulative Papists and Jesuits, who scorn the divisiveness and fragmentation of British religious life. When they attack James's church-reconstruction program, these Chiliasts prove that "A wall-palsy is ever dangerous." Rather than further polarization within Christianity, Britain should

⁹⁷ William Laud, *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, William Laud, D.D.*, ed. William Scott (Oxford: John Parker, 1847), I, 26.

aim at peaceful reconciliation with Catholic countries: "Let them return to primitive truth, and our quarrel is ended." Two decades later, these words would come back to haunt Laud when he was arrested by his Puritan antagonists.

Despite the campaign by king, poet, clergyman, architect, and commission, the rebuilding of St. Paul's continued to be thwarted by insufficient finances and rebellion among the craftsmen. In 1622 Farley launched another appeal for the cause, this time directed at the workmen. In *Portland-stone in Paules-Church Yard*, Farley described himself as "a Free-man of London, who hath done as freely for Free-stone within these eight years, as most Men."⁹⁸ From the details in the poem, it is clear that Farley watched closely the masons at their task, and he may have been initiated into the operative lodge in the churchyard. Underlining the importance of the Portland stone, which presented a new challenge to London craftsmen, Farley made the stones themselves speak about the spiritual significance of the architectural project. The stones remind the artisans that "Ere since the Architect/of Heavens faire frame,/Did make the World,/And Man to use the same," the careful and reverent builder earns God's favor:

Not for precedency, lest then you erre,
For alls one here, both Free and Forreyner;
And as she doth receive all sorts to prayer,
So any Worke-Man, and good Surveyor,
She may retaine to gaine her Reparation
As for the Church is us'd in every Nation.

.....
And 'cause our Writer a poore Free-man is,
We hope these words no man can take amisse;
For what he write's according to his oath,
Which to infringe we know he will be loath;
That is, the Cities honor to maintaine,
And also to advance her honest gaine.

And so once againe we doe revive our Muse,
And to all workmen doe more counsell use;
Learne by the scriptures what you ought to doe
Let them direct your hands and conscience to,

Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles and Kings.

And *Haggai* will shew you many things:
How justly men did worke about the Temple,

⁹⁸ Henry Farley, *Portland-stone in Paules Church Yard* (G.E.[ld] for R.M.[ilbourne], 1622).

Which there is Registered for your example;
 And with what joy and love they did proceed,
 The Booke of God will shew you if you reade;
 For happy was that man that could devise
 Most curious worke to grace that Edifice . . .

According to Farley, many of the masons in London resented foreign craftsmen and did not respect the architectural projects of king and church. Like Dunfermline earlier in Edinburgh, he criticized the craftsmen for drinking too much and idling on the job. Even worse, some tried to use inferior materials for mere convenience sake. To Farley, “hee that in this worke proves such a Jobber,/Is but a kinde of Sacrireligious Robber.” In such circumstances, an infusion of chivalric idealism into the masonic restorers of Britain’s Solomonic Temple would serve practical purposes.

That James envisioned a close relationship between the Banqueting House and the Order of Garter was revealed in his decision to “pre-inaugurate” the new Temple by holding the Order’s St. George’s Feast in the unfinished building on 25 April 1621.⁹⁹ James’s attempted merger of chivalric idealism and Solomonic mysticism was attractive to Dunfermline and Kerr, who acquired Scaliger’s treatise on ancient Jewish building fraternities; the architectural works of Vitruvius, Serlio, Scamozzi, Alberti, and Palladio; a volume on the institutions of the Order of the Garter; histories of the Knights Hospitallers, Knights of Malta, and other chivalric orders.¹⁰⁰ The Scottish courtiers also read a curious argument about the ancient Jewish roots of chivalric fraternities in André Favyn’s *Le Théâtre d’honneur et de chivalrie* (Paris, 1619). The book was subsequently published in English as *The Theater of Honour and Knight-hood* (1623) and dedicated to Sir Henry Montague, privy counsellor and lord treasurer to the king.

Favyn traced the orders of knighthood back to the ancient Hebrews, who followed Seth’s method of maintaining their families in the fear of God: “They made use to themselves of Symboles, and Hieroglyphickes, which fall under the sense, are seene, and touched both with the finger and the eye, they drew them by degrees to those

⁹⁹ P. Palme, *Triumph*, 63–64.

¹⁰⁰ National Library of Scotland: Crawford and Balcarres Papers—ACC 9769. MS. 14/2/2. Catalogue of books of Earl of Dunfermline at Pinkie (1625); also, Kerr’s library.

things which were invisible."¹⁰¹ Citing the "Rabbi Abraham, in his historicall Cabala," he claimed that King Solomon adopted these emblems and preserved them in the Temple. Thus, Favyn's subsequent description of Charles Martel, "the Hammer of the Saracens" and hero of early masonic documents, as the heir of the Jews' Cabalistic tradition is relevant to Masonic developments in Britain. Like the Jews, Martel utilized mystical emblems when he instituted the first order of knighthood in France, the Gennet.¹⁰² In honor of his crusading achievements, he was given the keys to the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. Martel's knights were always armed when they met "in their Temples" (possibly a source of the eighteenth-century practice of posting armed "knights" at the doors of *Écossais* lodge meetings.) Though Favyn accepted the official Catholic position that Martel was a heretic, he made clear that "atheists and pretended Reformists of our Age doe make a mockery" of the Catholic version of Martel's damnation. As noted earlier, the "Reformist" James not only admired Martel but identified him with the early Stewarts.

Favyn also discussed in detail the rise and fall of the Knights Templar, who "were so couragious as possibly men could be."¹⁰³ Giving the original rules of the Templars, he granted them a positive influence in their early days. However, when the Templars became too proud and independent, they betrayed the Catholic church by collaborating with the Saracens and the "Old Man of the Mountain." Reiterating the charges of sodomy and black magic, Favyn defended the veracity of "our chronicles written by eye witnesses" against the counter-versions produced in Italy, Spain, and England. The English defense of the Templars had been produced by James's Master of the Revels, Sir George Buc, in 1615. Favyn admitted that many Frenchmen continued to admire the last Grand Master of the Templars, "Jacques de la Maule" (de Molay), whose "portraiture is yet to be seen at many places in Paris."

Much of Favyn's history served as propaganda for continuation of the ancient Franco-Scottish alliance. He reiterated the Gathelus and Scota tradition of Scotland's Egyptian origins, and he praised the Scots for their heroic service to Charlemagne and Godfrey of

¹⁰¹ Andrew Favine, *The Theater of Honour and Knight-Hood* (London: William Iaggard, 1623), part 1, p. 2.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 16, 310-18, 334.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 400-07.

Bouillon.¹⁰⁴ He then linked the English theft of the Stone of Scone with Edward III's founding of the Order of the Garter—a controversy that was now resolved because James assimilated the emblems of the Garter into those of the Scottish Order of the Thistle. Favyn praised Robert Stuart, Lord of Aubigny, as “the Father of Chivalrie,” and repeated all the Scottish claims of ancestral service in the Crusades. Given continuing Puritan criticism of James's support for the Scots Guard in Paris, Favyn's praise of the Guard's many religious and ceremonial duties seemed targeted at current controversies. In 1623, when the English translation of Favyn was published, the Privy Council received reports of mock orders of chivalry formed on the fringes of James's court.¹⁰⁵ Anti-Puritan and pro-Spanish, these secret societies provide an odd foreshadowing of similar *Écossais* fraternities (such as the orders of Tobosco and Awazu) in the eighteenth century. They will be further discussed in the context of Prince Charles's journey to Spain.

Much to James's disappointment, his grandiose architectural projects for Temples of Concord occurred within an international context of increasing sectarianism and violence. Even sadder for the king was the fact that his own son-in-law, the Elector Palatine Frederick V, was the instigator of religious hostilities that contributed to the devastating Thirty Years' War. From his court at Heidelberg, Frederick nursed dreams of a Protestant crusade against Catholicism, while many participants in the Rosicrucian movement looked to him as their political leader. Since the publication of the *Fama* and *Confessio* of 1614–15, the movement had provoked a flood of pamphlets, pro and contra. In 1616 a Lutheran preacher, Johann Valentin Andreae, published anonymously at Strasburg the *Chymische Hochzeit Christiani Rosencreutz*, which featured John Dee's hieroglyphic monad in the margin of its opening pages. Yates argues that Andreae was inspired by the wedding of the Elector Palatine and Elizabeth Stuart to rework an earlier alchemical romance in order to link them to the *Fama* and *Confessio*:

... the plan of the allegories in all three works bears the stamp of minds working in concert, bent on sending out into the world their

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., part II, 67–69, 78–97.

¹⁰⁵ J.S.A. Adamson, “Chivalry and Political Culture in Caroline England,” in P. Lake, *Culture and Politics*, 166.

myth of Christian Rosencreutz, a benevolent figure, centre of brotherhoods and orders.¹⁰⁶

She adds that "the 'more secret philosophy' underlying the Rosicrucian publications was that of John Dee."

Though J.W. Montgomery argues that Andreae was not a Rosicrucian, more recent scholars demonstrate that he contributed to the early tracts but subsequently rejected the political and "vulgar" exploitation of the movement.¹⁰⁷ Despite Andreae's own statement that *The Chemical Wedding* was a "ludibrium" or jest, many readers added the work to the emerging Rosicrucian canon.¹⁰⁸ Andreae definitely shared Dee's mystical and practical interest in mathematics, but there is no evidence that *The Chemical Wedding* was influential in Jacobean England. However, Andreae's subsequent Utopian works, translations of Du Bartas's "masonic" poetry, and perspective drawings for an edition of the *Templum Ezechielus* would provoke sympathetic interest among millenarians and Freemasons in Jacobean Scotland and Carolinian England.¹⁰⁹

The major flaw in Yates's thesis is her assumption that Andreae would have opposed James's attempts to maintain peace in Europe and would have supported his son-in-law's illegal acceptance of the Bohemian crown. Even before these events, Andreae lamented the destruction and violence provoked by religious hostilities in his community in 1617.¹¹⁰ From James's patronage of Robert Fludd and the Macolo brothers, who sympathized with the Hermetic-Cabalistic ideals of the Rosicrucian manifestoes, it seems clear that he was not inimical to those ideals but rejected the militants' advocacy of violence to achieve them. Godwin argues that Fludd knew Inigo Jones, participated in the circle of royal masque-makers, and contributed mechanical devices for scenery and music in the masques.¹¹¹ In his

¹⁰⁶ F. Yates, *Rosicrucian*, 65.

¹⁰⁷ John Warwick Montgomery, *Cross and Crucible: Johann Valentin Andreae (1586-1654)* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973), I, 186-255; D. Dickson, *Tessera*, 18-88.

¹⁰⁸ For the competing theories about Andreae as author of the *Fama* and *Confessio*, see S. Akerman, *Rose Cross*, 7-8, 30, 69-74.

¹⁰⁹ Johan Valentin Andreae, *Christianopolis*, trans. Edward Thompson (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1999), 285-302; Stanley Beeler, "Johann Valentin Andreae," *Dictionary of Literary Biography*, vol. 164: *German Baroque Writers, 1580-1660*, ed. James Hardin (Detroit: Gale Research Inc., 1996), 13-19.

¹¹⁰ J. Montgomery, *Cross and Crucible*, I, 64.

¹¹¹ Joscelyn Godwin, *Robert Fludd* (Boulder: Shambala, 1979), 9; for further evidence of Fludd's friendship with Jones, see V. Hart, *Art and Magic*, 78.

Tractatus Apologeticus Integritatem Societatis de Rosea Cruce defendens (1617), Fludd described his construction of a fire-spitting dragon (for use in a masque) and boasted that his musical instruments were well received by the royal musicians. The king also knew that the reform of mathematics and chemistry advocated by Fludd and the Rosicrucians could produce useful products for the state. James even hoped to make a personal profit from Fludd's experiments in producing high quality steel.¹¹²

In August 1618 Fludd began writing his "Philosophicall Key," based on an alchemical experiment upon wheat that he had discussed with the king.¹¹³ He dedicated the manuscript to James and then defended himself against "detractors and calumniators," who accused him of collaborating personally with the Rosicrucians and of accepting fully their subversive notions of religion, morality, and politics. Fludd argued back that, much to his disappointment, he got no response to his appeals to join the order. "By dayly discourses and books it may well appeare" that "many thousands" had similarly failed in their attempts to get in touch with the fraternity." He then played down his defence of the fraternity in 1616 as "a certain silly and poore Apology." However, Fludd still believed in the ideals of the Rosicrucians, for their "Pansophia" was similar to his own alchemical theosophy. Because Fludd described his production of a healing ointment during his experiment on wheat, his treatise would certainly have interested the king who, like Fludd, suffered from arthritic pains.

Not only this practical benefit from Rosicrucian-medicine but the spiritual benefit from regeneration of the inner man made the fraternity's ideals worth pursuing. If they had really achieved "the Coelestiall or spirituall Bread" and the immediate knowledge of "the all in all," then they must be ranked among the sages whom Solomon mentioned in *Proverbs 3* (who found wisdom more precious than gold and long life). Fludd stressed the importance of "dew meditation and judicious contemplation" in order to achieve their blissful state of personal inwardness and universal fraternity:

To climb up to God is to enter into oneself and to pierce the centre of one's soul so as to behold the Creator . . . By closing up the carnal

¹¹² W. Huffman, *Fludd*, 23–24.

¹¹³ C.H. Josten, "Robert Fludd's 'Philosophicall Key' and His Alchemical Experiment Upon Wheat," *Ambix*, 11 (1963), 1–23.

senses, by converting every outward affection into the inward self, one may attain a blessed life and converse with Demogorgon who dwells within. Inwardness will make men more charitably disposed, because it makes them aware of their essential brotherhood in God's spirit.¹¹⁴

In another work dedicated to James, tractate two of *The History of the Macrocosm* (1618), Fludd made clear his expertise in the "universal arithmetic," geometry, perspective, surveying, and fortress-building—arts clearly connected with Freemasonry.¹¹⁵ In the second volume of *Microcosm* (1619), he revealed his highly architectural version of the Art of Memory.¹¹⁶ According to Godwin, who practices Fludd's mnemonic technique and finds it dramatically successful, the memory is enhanced by transmuting concepts into visual and spatial images.¹¹⁷ In Fludd's engraved illustration, the things to be memorized are brought from the obscurity of the back of the head and exposed to the eye of imagination (passing through three ventricles in the brain). In the architectural illustration of this theory, called "Theatre of the World," Fludd revealed a series of doors, arches, windows, etc., which would place the concepts in the memory.

Though Fludd implied in works prepared in 1618 that he no longer believed in the existence of the Rosicrucian fraternity, in 1619 he met Joachim Morsius, a visitor from Hamburg, who wrote Rosicrucian tracts and affirmed the reality of the brotherhood.¹¹⁸ Morsius also met Ben Jonson and Cornelius Drebbel, whose alchemical and theosophical tracts he later edited. A brilliant technological inventor, the Dutch-born Drebbel had served Prince Henry and Princess Elizabeth at her court in Heidelberg, and he has long been considered a Rosicrucian by scholars.¹¹⁹ Morsius received an M.A. from Cambridge and then returned to the Continent, where he would spend decades attempting to implement Andreae's utopian vision, which he merged with the Rosicrucian laws published by Maier in *Themis Aurea* (1618).

It is unknown if Morsius also met Robert Kerr, but the Scot did share his interest in Maier's *Themis Aurea* and Andreae's *Reipublicae*

¹¹⁴ Ibid., 11.

¹¹⁵ W. Huffman, *Fludd*, 49, 52.

¹¹⁶ F. Yates, *Art of Memory*, 321–37.

¹¹⁷ Joeselyn Godwin, *Robert Fludd* (Boulder: Shambala, 1979), 89.

¹¹⁸ D. Dickson, *Tessera*, 138–41.

¹¹⁹ R. Heisler, "Rosicrucianism," 38–40; S. Akerman, *Rose Cross*, 17, 145.

Christianopolitanae (1619), and he acquired both books for his library.¹²⁰ In Andreae's description of the role of craftsmen in his ideal world, Kerr would have recognized the similarity to the role of Scottish Freemasons in their real world:

... those [craftsmen] which have greater art and skill belong in the inner square, and what is easier belongs in the outer, larger square. For the relationship between a clockmaker and a sawmaker is the same at that between ... a sculptor and a stonemason. The distinctively novel thing is this, that almost all of these craftsmen are educated men. What other people believe to be suitable for only a few men ... the Christianopolitans believe ought to be open to everyone. They think that learning is not of such subtlety, and craftsmanship is not so difficult, that one man is not able to master both if he has the time ...

Finally, they do not always practise these crafts because they are driven to do so by necessity, but as a contest of the artisans with each other so that the human spirit may be able to develop itself through devising various things. In this way that little spark which is truly present within us as a sign of reason or divinity may shine out, embodied in some material object.¹²¹

Though Scottish Masons did not open their fraternal secrets to "everyone," for both economic and religious reasons, they did allow interested students of their craft to become initiated brothers. Like Kerr and his Masonic associates, Andreae was well-read in Vitruvian and Palladian works on architecture, and he was especially impressed by the design of Tycho Brahe's Uraniborg, which influenced his architectural design for Christianopolis.¹²² As noted earlier, the design and masonic techniques at Uraniborg also influenced King James, Schaw, and their craftsmen.

Andreae used terms strikingly similar to those of Masonic lore in his chapter on "Mystic Numbers." The more advanced students in Christianopolis are allowed to go beyond arithmetic and geometry to the study of mystic numbers:

It is certain that that Supreme Architect did not make this immense machine, the universe, at random, but incorporated measurements, numbers, and proportions into it most wisely, and added divisions of time to it in a wonderful harmony. Above all, He placed His mysteries for us in His workshops and typical buildings, so that we may

¹²⁰ Kerr's library.

¹²¹ J. Andreae, *Christianopolis*, 171–72.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 51–55.

unlock the longitude, the latitude and the depth of divinity using the key of David . . .¹²³

However, Andreae was already worried about the furore created by the Rosicrucian pamphlet war, and he warned about the Naometrian numerologies exploited by militant millenarians. "It is advisable that we be cautious in this Cabbala, and moderate in our suppositions," for only a select few gain the gift of prophecy.

Like James's architect-masons, Andreae envisioned a temple at the center of Christianopolis—"a royally magnificent building in which opulence vies with art," and "the walls are bright and elegant with beautiful paintings of religious subjects."¹²⁴ He then lambasted those "who under the pretext of religion despoil churches" and "forbid the decoration of the House of God." Like James's masque-makers, Andreae called for "sacred plays" to be presented in the temple, "so that religious knowledge may stick more permanently in the souls of the youth, and so that their own talents in treating such matters may be made more expert and skillful." For Kerr, who supported the king's architectural and theatrical agenda, Andreae's warnings about the violence created by radical iconoclasts and millenarians must have been instructive. In *Christianopolis*, Andreae pessimistically observed that "what we are doing" in struggling for peaceful reform "will some day have judgement passed on it by posterity—if there is any."

However, Kerr continued to believe in the pacific form of Rosicrucianism. While reading *Christianopolis*, he also collected Fludd's works, and his and Morsius's encouragement perhaps influenced Fludd to return to Rosicrucian themes in the third volume of *Microcosm* (1621). Fludd now expanded the significance of the imaginative eye to the divine "all-seeing eye," which appears within a radiant sun above a pair of wings. Linking the Hebrew tetragrammaton and the praying King David below is a motto similar to that on Dee's *Monas Hieroglyphica* and the *Fama*—"Under the shadow of thy wings will I rejoice."¹²⁵ The all-seeing eye would appear in many Rosicrucian treatises, and it would eventually be considered an emblem of Freemasonry.

From 1618 to 1621, there was nothing in Fludd's expressed views to disturb King James, who enjoyed learned discussions with him

¹²³ Ibid., 231–32.

¹²⁴ Ibid., 257–58, 263, 287.

¹²⁵ J. Godwin, *Fludd*, 34.

and continued to honor him with royal patronage. Fludd also received praise as a Rosicrucian in a tract dedicated to Ludovick Stuart, Second Duke of Lennox and a protégé of James, by John Thornborough, bishop of Worcester. In *Lithotheoricos* (1621), the bishop implied that not only Fludd but Lennox shared his interest in Hermetic research, which he defined mainly in Lullist terms. That Lennox also served on James's building commission and worked with Inigo Jones suggests an overlap in their Hermetic-Lullist-Masonic interests. Both James and Jones received Rosicrucian-style medical treatment from Thornborough and Fludd, which further suggests the acceptability of the latter's occultist research.¹²⁶

However, James was increasingly alarmed by the political and military ambitions of the radical fringe in the Rosicrucian territories in Germany. Unfortunately, events soon made it impossible to separate Hermetic ideals from political realities. In Bohemia the new Catholic king, Ferdinand of Styria, ended the policy of religious toleration maintained by the late Emperor Rudolph II and began a crackdown on the Bohemian church. The Bohemian Protestants resisted Ferdinand and went into open rebellion. From the Palatinate, Frederick V supported the rebels' urgent request that England send military assistance. However, James stalled on answering their appeal until he could consult with Spain. In July Philip III suggested that James, "as a virtuous Prince with great prestige in Europe," should act as mediator between the Emperor and Bohemians.¹²⁷ Flattered by Spain and caught up in Solomonian dreams of grandeur, James accepted the role.

In the meantime, the rebels determined to pursue their assault on the Empire. Arguing that the Bohemian crown was elective and not hereditary in the house of Hapsburg, they decided on 26 August 1619 to offer it to Frederick of the Palatinate. Not only James but many Lutheran princes in Germany urged Frederick to reject the offer, which had been rendered even more dangerous by the selection of Ferdinand as emperor of the Holy Roman Empire in August. Thus, Frederick was legally bound to obey Ferdinand in the matter of the Bohemian crown.¹²⁸ When the reckless Frederick, pushed by

¹²⁶ V. Hart, *Art and Magic*, 45, 80.

¹²⁷ D. Willson, *King James*, 409.

¹²⁸ F. Yates, *Rosicrucian Enlightenment*, 18–24.

militant Calvinists, accepted the crown on 28 September, it amounted to a declaration of war against the Hapsburg powers. Oblivious to the dangers ahead, Frederick and Elizabeth travelled to Prague, where they would enjoy a romantic interlude as "The Winter King and Queen of Bohemia."

The events stimulated a revival of interest in Rosicrucianism in England and Scotland, where many Protestants interpreted the coronation in millenial terms. James had sent his Scottish courtier Sir James Hay (Viscount Doncaster) and his royal chaplain John Donne to Holland and Germany to investigate and mediate the prospects for peaceful resolution.¹²⁹ Doncaster and Donne were close friends of Robert Kerr, and Donne left all his papers in Kerr's safe-keeping while he was away.¹³⁰ However, when the emissaries returned with arguments for the Palatinate cause, James was so annoyed that both withdrew from public support of the Protestant crusade. Could Doncaster and Donne have been the source of Kerr's acquisition of German Rosicrucian works? Perhaps the critical political situation led Kerr to translate the *Fama* and *Confessio* into Scots-English, for he used paper that was watermarked 1620.¹³¹

Despite the outpouring of popular support for the Winter King and Queen, James still hoped to resolve the issues peacefully, and he devoted much study to the minutiae of Bohemian legal precedents. He soon received conflicting advice from two Scotsmen. Sir Andrew Gray, a Scottish officer in Bohemian service, returned to England to beg leave to levy a regiment for Frederick that would be paid out of a City of London loan.¹³² Gray brought with him a letter from James's grandson, Prince Frederick Henry, who pleaded for help. The king was much moved by the appeal, but he also accurately foresaw the ramification of Frederick's rash act into widespread Protestant-Catholic war in Europe. While he agonized over Gray's petition, James received contrary counsel from the Scottish writer James Maxwell, who had earlier supported the Rosicrucian call for reform but now argued against Frederick's actions. In 1619

¹²⁹ See Paul Sellin, *So Doth, So is Religion: John Donne and Diplomatic Contexts in the Reformed Netherlands, 1619-1620* (Columbia: Missouri UP, 1988).

¹³⁰ R. Kerr, *Correspondence*, I, xxxiii, 24. Donne shared Kerr's interest in Cabalistic theories.

¹³¹ Kerr's library; A. McLean, "Manuscript Sources."

¹³² Pauline Gregg, *King Charles I* (Berkeley: California UP, 1981), 62.

Maxwell attempted to transmute the Protestant-Catholic hostilities into a unified Christian crusade against the Turks. In *Carolana*, he appealed to Prince Charles to remember Scotland's ancient Hebraic-Egyptian heritage and to lead a crusade against the Muslim infidels that would restore Jacob's Stone to the Holy Land.

Then, in summer 1620, in a pamphlet that is now lost, Maxwell argued that the Bohemian crown was not elective and that the recent deposition of one king and election of another was unlawful.¹³³ Baron Dohna, Frederick's ambassador in England, complained to the Privy Council about Maxwell's pamphlet, and the voice of pacific Rosicrucianism was sent to the Tower in June.¹³⁴ On 23 July Francis Bacon wrote to Buckingham about the case:

The two Goose-quills, Maxwell and Alured, have been pulled; and they have made submissions in that kind which the board thought fit. For we would not do them the honour to require a recantation of their opinion, but an acknowledgement of their presumption.

His Majesty doth very wisely, (Not shewing much care or regard of it,) yet really to suppress this licentious course of talking and writing.¹³⁵

Though James eventually shared the opinion of the "presumptuous" Maxwell, he agreed with Bacon that the profusion of pamphlets on the Bohemian question "kindleth" malice and discontent among the public.

The Winter King's romantic interlude in Prague was soon over, for Frederick's inadequate forces were faced by the massed Catholic armies of the Duke of Bavaria. In September 1620 the Spanish army under Spinola invaded the Palatinate, and on 8 November Frederick's forces were crushed at the Battle of White Mountain outside Prague. Frederick and his wife were forced into humiliating flight, eventually finding refuge at The Hague. In England and Scotland, there was great sympathy for Elizabeth Stuart, and various schemes emerged to send volunteers to fight for her. The Lord Mayor of London raised funds for the cause, including a substantial donation from the Masons' Company.¹³⁶ Radical Protestants in England issued apocalyptic warnings

¹³³ A. Williamson, *Scottish National Consciousness*, 106, 182n.39; *CSP. Domestic. James I*, X, 194.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, X, 158.

¹³⁵ F. Bacon, *Works*, XIV, 110. Alured had sent Buckingham a treatise against the Spanish match, which led the king to order his imprisonment.

¹³⁶ E. Conder, *Hole Craft*, 149.

about the fall of the Papist anti-Christ, while self-proclaimed Rosicrucians in Germany published millenaral prophecies.

Believing that Frederick's acceptance of the Bohemian crown was illegal, James determined to persuade the Spanish king to join with him in restoring Frederick to the Palatinate, where he had been a legal ruler. James's subsequent pursuit of a Spanish marriage for Prince Charles was part of this agenda for achieving peace in the territories of the Rosicrucian furore, now torn by religious warfare.¹³⁷ Still seeing himself as the Solomonic judge in the dispute, James received enthusiastic support from Charles and from his favorite, Buckingham. In fact, their support was so enthusiastic that they pursued a quixotic mission to Spain in February 1623. Travelling incognito and making a surprise arrival, the two knights-errant shocked the Spanish and English diplomats in Madrid into accelerating the negotiations on Charles's marriage and restoration of the Palatinate.¹³⁸

A worried James sent a stream of emotional letters to the young men, which further undermine modern charges of his homosexual relationship with Buckingham. As Beasley observes, "James's letters to the two of them read more like the outpourings of a doting father to two sons, than like letters to one son and a lover."¹³⁹ In March James sent Robert Kerr to Madrid to assist them in their mission.¹⁴⁰ After Prince Henry's death, Kerr had transferred to Charles's court, where he became his trusted confidante. The Scots believed that Kerr had so much influence on Charles that even Buckingham was jealous. Well-versed in Spanish history, architecture, and mystical traditions, he was a valuable mentor for the impulsive young men.

During their nine-months' residency in Spain, Charles and Buckingham gradually realized that the Spaniards were deceiving them about the marriage and the Palatinate. Though the political and religious agenda of their journey ultimately failed, they did benefit from their exposure to the great Spanish art collections. As Gregg observes, when Charles met the eighteen year-old Philip IV, he recognized that "this boy had an appreciation of art and letters far beyond his own and that the Spanish Court was already showing the artistic brilliance that would characterize the reign."¹⁴¹ With King James

¹³⁷ See R. Lockyer, *James VI and I*, 131–33.

¹³⁸ D. Willson, *King James*, 430–35.

¹³⁹ A. Beasley, "Disability," 160.

¹⁴⁰ R. Kerr, *Correspondence*, I, xi–xvi.

¹⁴¹ P. Gregg, *Charles I*, 82.

and Inigo Jones planning the massive reconstruction of Whitehall Palace as a Temple of Solomon, the prince's first-hand inspection of the architecture and interior decoration of the Escorial was important. While Kerr studied the Escorial, he also acquired Villalpando's treatise on the Jewish temples.¹⁴²

In the Escorial library, Charles saw the unusual series of frescoes that expressed the tolerant, eclectic philosophy of Montano and the Familists. Solomon was portrayed as the patron of mathematics, while pagan and Jewish intellectual heroes received homage equal to their Christian contemporaries.¹⁴³ Another addition to the British party was Balthazar Gerbier, a Huguenot emigré from Holland, who served as architect, art collector, and secret diplomatic agent for Buckingham. Chaney notes that Gerbier was so esteemed by Charles and Buckingham that he was initially included in their secret plans for the mission.¹⁴⁴ Gerbier would later praise the stonemasonry of the Escorial ("a body solid like a rock"), and he assimilated into his own architectural theories the Temple mysticism articulated by its builders.¹⁴⁵ Charles was flattered when his Spanish hosts promised that his name would be inscribed on a commemorative pillar at the Escorial, and he developed a lifelong interest in Villalpando's exposition of its Solomonic and Lullist principles.¹⁴⁶

When the prince and duke returned to England in October 1623, they were so angry at the Spanish government for its intransigence that they joined the Puritan war party which was determined to send troops to the Palatinate. Thus, Kerr's Rosicrucian treatises took on increased political significance. It was perhaps Buckingham's newly political "Rosicrucianism" that prompted his friend Sir John Eliot, a vociferous supporter of the Winter King, to place English manuscript translations of the *Fama* and *Confessio* among his diplomatic papers on Spain.¹⁴⁷ Eliot's later hatred of Buckingham grew out of his increasingly militant vision of the Protestant campaign.

¹⁴² Kerr's library.

¹⁴³ B. Rekers, *Montano*, 114–15.

¹⁴⁴ E. Chaney, *Evolution*, 217.

¹⁴⁵ See Balthazar Gerbier, *Counsel and Advice to All Builders* (London: Thomas Mabb, 1663), dedication to Sir Peter Killigrew; on Solomonic and Masonic themes, *passim*.

¹⁴⁶ P. Gregg, *Charles I*, 94; R. Strong, *Britannia's Triumph*, 61; A.W. Johnson, *Ben Jonson*, 239–42.

¹⁴⁷ Ron Heisler discovered these manuscripts in the library of Eliot's descendant, the present Earl of St. Germans in Cornwall; see A. McLean, "Manuscript Sources."

Among the entourage that returned from Spain, there was also a significant body of English military officers whose Catholic sympathies led them to volunteer for the mission. They remained loyal to James's policy of alliance with Spain and increasing tolerance for Catholics in Britain. Disappointed at the shift of foreign policy under Prince Charles and Buckingham, they joined two secret fraternities which maintained solidarity and morale in the face of Puritan opposition. The first fraternity, the "Titere-tu," was formed by veterans of the English regiment raised by the Catholic Lord Vaux in 1622 to fight for the Hapsburgs in Flanders (as part of a conciliatory gesture by James to Spain).¹⁴⁸ The name "Titere-tu" was taken from the first words of Virgil's *Eclogue*, but it also drew on the obscene allusion of "tityros," referring to satyrs, "particularly those endowed with enormous penises." Some veterans of the Spanish mission joined the "Titere-tu," while others formed a closely linked fraternity, the "Order of the Bugle" (named for the bugle or tubular glass bead that was sewn onto clothing). Initiates of the Bugle had been impressed by the Spanish orders of chivalry, and they took oaths, swore brotherhood, and vowed loyalty to their cause.

Though the officers spent most of their time drinking and composing bawdy verses, the secret fraternities provoked alarm among Puritan politicians, who had ordered surveillance over them throughout 1623. On 6 December the anti-Catholic polemicist John Chamberlain reported:

There is a knot of such kind of people [Papists] discovered who under cover of goode fellowship have made an association and taken certain oaths and orders devised among themselves, specially to be true and faithfull to the societie and to conceale one anothers secrets, but mixed with a number of other ridiculous toyes to disguise the matter, as having a Prince whom they call Ottoman, wearing of blew or yellow ribans . . . having certain nicknames (as Titere-tu and such like) for their severall fraternities . . . What mischeife may lurke under this maske God knowes, but sure they were very confident and presumed much of themselves to carrie yt so openly.¹⁴⁹

As the membership of the fraternities swelled, other Puritans expressed their alarm. Walter Younger noted in his diary:

¹⁴⁸ J. Adamson, "Chivalry," 166.

¹⁴⁹ Timothy Raylor, *Cavaliers, Clubs, and Literary Culture: Sir John Mennes, James Smith, and the Order of the Fancy* (Newark: Delaware UP, 1994), 75.

The beginning of December, 1623, there was a great number in London, haunting taverns and other debauched places, who swore themselves in a brotherhood, and named themselves *Tytere tues* . . . he that was to be sworn . . . was to make oath that he would aid and assist all other of his fellowship, and not disclose their council. There were divers knights, some young noblemen, and gentlemen of this brotherhood, and they were to know one the other by a black bugle which they wore, and their followers to be known by a blue ribbon.¹⁵⁰

On 19 December the House of Lords commanded that Michael Constable, a founder of the Order of the Bugle, be interrogated about the purpose and organization of the fraternities. From his statement, it is clear that members were recruited from the Spanish entourage, that they used a password, contributed to a common fund, and modelled many of their rituals (both convivial and serious) on those used by apprentices during initiation into craftsmen's fraternities. At least two members were imprisoned for a time, at the instigation of the vigorously anti-Catholic Archbishop Abbot. However, King James did not see the fraternities as a threat, and several of the initiated "knights" became members of his household.¹⁵¹ During this period, Robert Kerr acquired many books on the organization of chivalric orders, which perhaps reflected his sympathy for the new fraternities.¹⁵²

As we shall see, these secret chivalric fraternities—dedicated to the king's pacific and tolerant policies—would stimulate the development of further loyalist-royalist brotherhoods when Charles I resumed his father's Solomonic policies in 1630. They also provide a prototype for the quasi-Masonic orders of Awazu and Tobosco formed by Jacobite Freemasons in Sweden and Europe in the eighteenth century. It is perhaps significant that a parallel development within Freemasonry occurred in 1623, when Inigo Jones presided over an inner group of "accepted" Freemasons who were loyal to the king's architectural agenda, despite the surly resistance displayed by many London masons to Jones' efforts to build two Catholic chapels for Charles's expected Spanish bride.

In the meantime, James was increasingly enfeebled by illness and depressed by the apparent failure of his pacific policies. He thus

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 76.

¹⁵¹ J. Adamson, "Chivalry," 350n.14.

¹⁵² Kerr's library.

granted increasing power to Buckingham to direct the government, which launched a new war policy. Buckingham utilized his architect Gerbier to keep the ciphers for his foreign correspondence and to carry out various secret negotiations. He and Charles continued to employ Inigo Jones as a propagandist in masque and masonry. This heightened prestige of the architect—no longer a mere artisan or designer but a diplomat and statesman—led to an acrimonious quarrel between Jones and his old collaborator Jonson. As Jones acted more like Schaw—a courtier intimate with the king, an architect determined to construct magnificent royal edifices, a Master of Works bent on reforming his masons—he appeared to critics more as autocrat than artist.

Though Jonson was well-read in Vitruvian literature, he argued that the higher principle of intellectual conception was the provenance of the poet rather than the architect.¹⁵³ While he was in Scotland, Jonson may have sensed the great importance of architecture and Freemasonry to James and his Scottish courtiers, for he returned with an intensified envy and hostility towards Jones. In a manuscript poem, "To His False Freind Mr. Ben Jonson," Jones lamented the change in Jonson's attitude, which rendered him "the best of Poetts but the worst of men."¹⁵⁴ Jones's lament was provoked by Jonson's increasingly bitter and public satires on the architect's claim to high philosophical as well as mathematical-mechanical expertise. Even more galling to the poet was the fact that the Master of Works now infused his "most serious theoretical assumptions about architecture" into the texts of his masques.¹⁵⁵

In January and May 1622, Jones used his *Masque of Augurs* as a vehicle for an architectural statement "as if to emphasize the relationship of his stage buildings to the ones he was actually erecting."¹⁵⁶ To achieve his "miraculous scenic effects," he built up a team of artists and craftsmen who knew immediately how to interpret his sketches, and these included his master mason Stone and master carpenter Partington from the Office of Works.¹⁵⁷ From Jonson's perspective,

¹⁵³ D.J. Gordon, "Poet and Architect: the Intellectual Setting of the Quarrel Between Ben Jonson and Inigo Jones," *JWCI*, 12 (1949), 159-75.

¹⁵⁴ J. Gotch, *Inigo Jones*, 254-55.

¹⁵⁵ Stephen Orgel and Royal Strong, *Inigo Jones: the Theatre of the Stuart Court* (Los Angeles: UCLA, 1973), I, preface.

¹⁵⁶ J. Harris, *King's Arcadia*, 83, 131.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 113; S. Orgel and R. Strong, *Inigo Jones*, I, 38-39.

the hubristic Jones now aspired to the powers of the *magus* as well as the divine architect. In the poet's anti-masque for *Neptune's Triumph* (1623–24), he implied a linkage between the pretensions of the Rosicrucians and the Freemasons. From Morsius he may have learned of the Rosicrucians' desire to elevate the status of the mechanical arts and improve the education of craftsmen—an ideal shared by Fludd. Perhaps he also became aware of the assimilation of Rosicrucian notions into Scottish Freemasonry.

In the anti-masque, Jonson satirized the high pretensions of Jones as architect and Master of Works by putting them in the mouth of a cook, who disputes with a poet:

Seduced Poet, I doe say to thee,—
 A Boyler, Range, and Dresser were the fountaines
 Of all the knowledge, in the Universe,
 And that's the Kitchin. Where, a Master-Cooke—
 Thou do know the man! nor canst thou know him!
 Til thou hast serv'd some yeares in that deep school,
 That's both the Nource, and Mother of the Arts,
 And hear'st him read, interpret, and demonstrate.
 A Master-Cooke! why, he is the man of men,
 For a Professor. He designes, he drawes,
 He paints, he carves, he builds, he fortifies,
 Makes Citadels of curious foule, and fish,
 Some he dry-ditches, some motes round with broths;
 Mounts marrow-bones; cuts fifty-angled custards;
 Reares bulwarke pies; and, for his outer workes,
 He raiseth ramparts of immortall crust;
 And teacheth all the tacticks at one dinner:
 What rankes, what files, to put his dishes in;
 The whole Art Militarie! Then he knowes
 The influence of the starres, upon his meates;
 And all their seasons, tempers, qualities,
 And so, to fit his relishes, and sauces!
 He has Nature in a pot! 'bove all the Chemists,
 Or bare-breechd brethren of the Rosie-Crosse!
 He is an Architect, an Inginer,
 A Souldier, a Physitian, a Philosopher;
 A generall Mathematician!¹⁵⁸

As noted earlier, all of these arts were considered the provenance of Freemasonry in Scotland, and it seems certain that the king

¹⁵⁸ B. Jonson, *Jonson*, VII, 684–85.

revealed to Jones the traditions of Scottish Masonry. Did Jones also share these traditions with Jonson? When the architect complained that Jonson deceived him and murdered a "trust," did he refer to the poet's indiscrete exposure of Masonic and Rosicrucian secrets?

While Jonson was writing *Neptune's Triumph*, Robert Napier (son of the logarithmist) published a work that seemed to confirm Jonson's linkage of Rosicrucianism and Scottish Masonry. In Napier's translation of John Baptista Lambi's *Revelation of the Secret Spirit* (1623), he described his eight years of travel in France, Italy, and Germany, where he sought out poor and rich alchemists.¹⁵⁹ Napier dedicated his translation to Bishop Thornborough and praised him for providing an Apollonian retreat, a living library, a flourishing academy, and a religious abbey, where he especially welcomed Hermetic students from Scotland, who have "always found your Lordship a constant and effectuall friend." Napier then drew on Lull and a host of alchemists to define "the soule of the world," for it is by this spirit that "Noe built the Arke, Moses the Tabernacle, and Solomon the Temple."¹⁶⁰ Napier noted that the author Lambi visited two Hermetic brothers in London, and he himself had contacts with the German Rosicrucian Daniel Müller.¹⁶¹

In that same year, Napier's thesis was reinforced by the Scottish courtier Patrick Scot, who published *The Tillage of Light, or a True Discoverie of the Philosophicall Elixir commonly called the Philosopher's Stone* (1623). Scot had earlier used masonic terminology in his *Omnibus and Singulus* (1619), and he now worked as a propagandist for the king's religious policies. He dedicated *The Tillage* to a Scottish nobleman—James, Third Marquis of Hamilton, a privy councillor and favorite of the king. Scot referred to "that All-Seeing eye which pearceth through ages"—possibly an early reference to the Masonic emblem of All-Seeing Eye.¹⁶² He argued that descriptions of the alchemical process are really allegories of the steps involved in acquiring wisdom and bringing it to perfection.¹⁶³ Drawing on Jewish and Hermetic traditions, Scot revealed his familiarity with the works of Michael

¹⁵⁹ J.B. Lambi, *A Revelation of the Secret Spirit*, trans. R.N.E. [identified as Robert Napier in British Library Catalogue] (London: John Haviland, 1623), preface.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., 12, 15, 25, 74–77.

¹⁶¹ J. Small, "Sketches," 418.

¹⁶² Patrick Scot, *The Tillage of Light* (London: W. Lee, 1623), 7.

¹⁶³ W. Huffman, *Fludd*, 62.

Scot, Ramon Lull, and Roger Bacon. However, he would prefer them to become more philosophical like Pythagoras and Plato than operative like so many current practitioners.

Scot's work elicited an anguished counter-blast from Fludd, who never named Scot but quoted passages from the *The Tillage*. Fludd may have been cautious about naming a servant of the king, and he left his refutation, entitled "Truth's Golden Harrow," in manuscript.¹⁶⁴ Fludd followed up on Scot's agricultural image of the tiller of soil by giving the harrow (a tool which breaks up clods of dirt) an alchemical meaning, one which had been emblemized in Michael Maier's *Atalanta Fugiens* (1618). Fludd seemed to worry that Scot's emphasis on the allegorical significance of Hermetic processes and terminology would undermine practical experimentation; after all, he had a royal patent to produce steel by chemical methods, and he hoped to produce alchemical medicines. In order to convince Scot's readers, who probably included the king, that practical alchemy was based on sound scriptural and philosophical principles, Fludd not only utilized masonic imagery but revealed its sources in Jewish mysticism.

Arguing that "the essence of God, which filleth every thinge in heaven and in earth" is "attired in in a naturall or materiall vestiment or mantle," Fludd concluded that in "the lively earth of man he erected his spirituall temple." Rather than over-allegorizing this temple, the author of *The Tillage* should respect the natural world as the vehicle of supernatural forces. Fludd then utilized a remarkable series of Hermetic-Jewish-Masonic images:

... this Elixir is the true temple of wisdom, the impregnable city of Cupid that powerfull god of Love, the bewtious and bright city of sages, the true patterne of the heavenly Jerusalem . . . And therfore he that is not a true beleever and lover of this excellent master peece . . . hath an iron gate before his eyes of understandinge; for this is the mirroir of truth, the celebre Thummim of the auncient Jews in whos centre dwelleth their bright Urim . . . the house of wisdom propped up w. 7. pillars . . . Now the Elixir is the temple of wisdom, or the earthly soone of the philosophers which is as well the tabernacle of the divine emanation as the heavenly.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶⁴ C.H. Josten, "Truth's Golden Harrow," *Ambix*, 3 (1949), 91-152.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 108.

To reject the material reality of the Elixir is to reject "the stone of Jacob in which God did dwell," as well as "the whit stone in which was wrighten a straung name that none could read."

To reinforce his argument, Fludd revealed his immersion in Jewish mysticism, which led him to praise the sage Cabalists, Rabbi Bahir, Archangelus the Cabalist, and Rabbi Tadeus Levi as the highest authorities. Through "their Cabalisticall Arithmetick," they enabled Hermes Trismegistus, Plato, and Pythagoras to envision "the most strong and mighty angell Metatron." Fludd then laboriously utilized this arithmetic to show how Moses gained a vision of the "posterious" of God:

... yet did he never behould his essentiall face or being: wherfore the Cabalists confess him to have unto the 49th gate of intelligence, but unto the 50th his human composition could never attayne unto ... Let us now see how the sage Cabalists do agree with this doctrine of the sacred Bible ... And Plato calleth it [the Elixir] the soule of the world which he measured by .999. for three times .9. amounting unto a .27. maketh the cube of the root. 3. which is the most perfectest number and therfore attributed unto the soule or first act in every creature. as.2. which is the number of confusion (as Pythagoras sayeth) is the roote of matter whos square is .4. and therefore his root is 8: This .999. of Plato by the addition of the Cabalists Aleph which signifyeth .1. in Arithemtick maketh up .1000. beyound the which ther is noe denomination ... I come therfore to the Cabalists' opinion tuchinge this first essence or emanation, wherby our authour [Patrick Scot] may know that Theosophists of each kind doe aver the reality and materiality of wisdomes dwelling place in this world.¹⁶⁶

Though we have no record of Scot's reaction to Fludd's criticism, much of the latter's "Cabalisticall Arithmetick" and Metatron mysticism would surface in the lodges of *Écossais* Freemasons in the 1740's. That Fludd's manuscript ended up in the collections of Elias Ashmole, a royalist Mason, suggests an infusion of Fludd's ideas into Stuart-style Masonry by the mid-seventeenth century.

According to Fludd, there were thousands of participants in the Rosicrucian controversy, and there was growing evidence that the fraternity actually existed. In 1623 Gabriel Naudé published *Instruction à la France sur la vérité de l'histoire des Frères de la Rose-Croix*, in which he claimed that placards appeared in Paris which announced the presence of the Rosicrucians:

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., 114–15.

We, being deputies of the principle College of the Brothers of the Rose Cross, are making a visible and invisible stay in this city . . . We show and teach without books or marks how to speak all languages of the countries where we wish to be, and to draw men from error and death.¹⁶⁷

Naudé included Paracelsus, Lull, Trithemius, Bruno, Dee and Fludd among philosophers admired by contemporary Rosicrucians. He noted the widespread interest in the fraternity throughout Germany and its reputation for new mechanical and scientific inventions. However, he concurred with their Jesuit critics that their aim was ultimately pernicious and seditious. Despite his negative opinion, Naudé's book included important information on the brotherhood, which evidently intrigued Robert Kerr, who acquired a copy of the *Instruction à la France*.¹⁶⁸

Two other tracts appeared in France in 1623, claiming that the Rosicrucians were real and dangerous, especially in Germany where they were centered. By 1624 the Court of Justice at The Hague became so alarmed at the widespread dissemination of Rosicrucian works that it commissioned two members to go to Leiden to consult the theological faculty at the university.¹⁶⁹ The faculty then spent six months examining the doctrines and practices of the sect before issuing their report (to be discussed later). In the meantime in England, Fludd's friend John Selden, the great jurist, shared his interest in the phenomenon and collected pamphlets on the subject. In 1709 Thomas Hearne, Jacobite librarian at the Bodleian, noted that Selden owned many works by Dee and greatly admired Fludd, because the latter "was of the Rosacrucian sect, and addicted himself to chymistry, of which Mr. Selden himself was an admirer."¹⁷⁰

Selden was also friendly with Ben Jonson and probably showed him his rare Hermetic texts and prints. This outburst of publicity about the Rosicrucian movement irritated Jonson, who perceived it as linked with the growing "Masonic" movement. The dramatist gained more inside knowledge about these alleged linkages through his intimacy with Sir Kenelm Digby, a Catholic Hermeticist, who

¹⁶⁷ F. Yates, *Rosicrucian*, 103.

¹⁶⁸ Kerr's library.

¹⁶⁹ J.P. Vaillant, "Notes and Queries: Rosicrucians," *AQC*, 7 (1894), 83. Based on documents in the Royal State Archives in Holland.

¹⁷⁰ Thomas Hearne, *Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1884-1921), II, 3-7, 277.

had participated in the Spanish mission and allegedly joined one of the secret chivalric fraternities.¹⁷¹ Knighted by James for his services in Spain, Digby was appointed to the Privy Council. Like Fludd, Digby felt free to demonstrate his Hermetic expertise to James, Charles, Buckingham, and even Bacon. Before leaving for Italy in 1620, Digby had consulted with Dr. Richard Napier about his occult studies, and while in Italy he obtained a mysterious "Powder of Sympathy," with which he performed Rosicrucian-style cures.¹⁷² James was so impressed by Digby's healing power that he asked for and received a portion of the Powder of Sympathy, which was also utilized by Fludd.

Fueled by his jealousy of the Masonic Inigo Jones and perturbed by the rise of Rosicrucian activity at the court, Jonson mocked both phenomena with increasing hostility. When his masque of *Neptune's Triumph* was finally performed in January 1625, Jonson coupled it with *The Fortunate Isles and Their Union*, which portrayed supporters of the Rosicrucians as gullible and greedy fools. The character Mere-Fool, a "Melancholique Student," had been frustrated in his long effort to see a real Rosicrucian, and thus he welcomed the offer by Jophiel, "an aëry spirit, and (according to the Magi) the Intelligence of Jupiters sphere," to reveal the spirits of Zoroaster, Hermes Trismegistus, Pythagoras, and Archimedes.¹⁷³ For background Jonson had read Theophilus Schweigardt's *Speculum Sopicum Rhodo-stauroticum* (1618), with its engraving of "a Castle i' th'ayre that runs upon wheeles with a wing'd lanthorne," which represented the invisible college of the Rosy Cross.¹⁷⁴ He also studied Pierre Morestel's *Artis Kabbalisticæ* (1621), which portrayed Lull as a Cabalist and his mnemonic-visualization techniques as a Cabalistic art.¹⁷⁵ The volume included illustrations of Lullist memory wheels and geometric-architectural visualizations which were relevant to Jones's scenic conceptions. In Nicolas Caussin's *De symbolica Aegyptiorum sapientia* (1623), Jonson read Philo's Life of Moses and explications of Egyptian and Hermetic mysticism.

¹⁷¹ T. Raylor, *Cavaliers*, 90–92, 96.

¹⁷² R.T. Petersson, *Sir Kenelm Digby* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1956), 47, 54, 265–66.

¹⁷³ B. Jonson, *Jonson*, VII, 707–29.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, X, 670n.99. Schweighardt was the pseudonym of Daniel Mögling.

¹⁷⁵ D. MacPherson, "Jonson's Library," 35, 73; Pierre Morestel, *Artis Kabbalisticæ, sive Sapientiae Divinae Academia* (Paris, 1621), 1, 6, 29.

In the satirical *Fortunate Isles*, Jonson linked the would-be members of the Rosicrucian castle with the avaricious monopolists who were currently being investigated for corruption:

The Farme of the great Customes,
Through all the Ports of the Aires Intelligences;
Then Constable of the Castle Rosy-Crosse:
Which you must be, and Keeper of the Keyes
Of the whole Kaball, with the Seales; you shall be
Principall Secretarie to the starres;
Know all their signatures, and combinations,
The divine rods, and consecrated roots.¹⁷⁶

Jophiel then offers to raise the spirits of Scogan and Skelton, minor English writers, who were the "Tityre tu of those times." This odd linking of the pro-Spanish secret society (recently investigated by the Privy Council) to the Rosicrucians pointed to the presence of initiated knights of Titire-tu at court. Jonson perhaps sensed that his satirical scalpel hit too near the bone, for he added, "Great King,/ Your pardon, if desire to please have trespass'd." Jones did not follow Jonson's directions in the costuming of Jophiel and Merefool, for he designed costumes that rendered them less ridiculous than Jonson intended.¹⁷⁷

Jonson may have felt vindicated in May 1625 when the Leiden faculty issued their report on the Rosicrucians. In a highly negative *Judicium*, they charged that the doctrines of the sect are in opposition to those of true religion as promulgated by the Reformed church and that measures should be taken against their adoption or propagation.¹⁷⁸ In June the court of justice prohibited meetings of the sect, which were held at Haarlem and other places in Holland. Perhaps encouraged by this censure, Jonson repeated in 1626 his satire on Jones (the master cook as master mason), and he revealed a surprising familiarity with such rare Rosicrucian works as Studion's unpublished *Naometria*, which he accurately defined as "the measuring o' the Temple: a Cabal."¹⁷⁹ We will return to Jonson's continuing attacks during the reign of Charles I, when he finally lost the patronage of that "Mason King" (and protector of Rosicrucians).

¹⁷⁶ B. Jonson, *Jonson*, VII, 712.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, X, 669; J. Harris, *King's Arcadia*, 135.

¹⁷⁸ J. Vaillant, "Notes," 83.

¹⁷⁹ In *The Staple of News* (1626); B. Jonson, *Jonson*, VI, 332, 338.

Though King James had long planned to make a return visit to Scotland, he sadly realized that his declining health made the journey impossible. Working with Chancellor Dunfermline, he had been an effective absentee ruler and boasted that he ruled his native kingdom with a pen. He so admired Dunfermline's conciliatory government that when his old friend died in 1622 he appointed another French- and Catholic-educated noble, George Hay of Netherliff, to succeed him.¹⁸⁰ An innovative technologist and enterprising industrialist, Hay shared Dunfermline's interest in architecture and masonry. Like his friend George Erskine, Hay served on the commission "anent the Bridge of Perth," which had been destroyed by a great flood in 1621. As noted earlier, Erskine had long been interested in Rosicrucianism and Freemasonry, and the commissioners may have learned of the Perth Masons' assimilation of Rosicrucianism into their craft "mystery."

James had greatly admired the bridge and its architect John Mylne, and he continued to appeal to the nation for contributions towards its rebuilding. Hay and Erskine also collaborated with Lord Mar and the Master of Works in their campaign to repair the palaces and bridges in expectation of the king's return.¹⁸¹ They were assisted by Archibald Napier and George Erskine, who were commissioned by the Privy Council to fund the building efforts and inspect the works-in-progress.¹⁸² However, like the king's project at St. Paul's, the bridge at Perth remained unfinished because of insufficient funds.

In spring 1623, nostalgic about his earlier fruitful collaboration with William Schaw, James ordered Mar to try to ease the financial problems of Schaw's heir Alexander Schaw and his family.¹⁸³ At the same time, perhaps remembering Schaw's interest in the Lullist Art of Memory, he honored his recently deceased court Lullists, the Macolo brothers. He ordered gifts of property in Scotland to the widow of Dr. James Macolo, who had dedicated to the king a Lullist-Paracelsan medical treatise, *Iatria Chymica* (1622), and benefactions to the family of his "late servant," Dr. John Macolo.

In 1623-24 the Scottish courtier James Cleland, who had earlier advised young gentlemen to master the skills of architect and master

¹⁸⁰ Deborah Howard, "The Kinnoull Aisle and Monument," *AH*, 39 (1996), 36-38.

¹⁸¹ *HMC. MSS. of Mar and Kellie*, 86, 95-96.

¹⁸² *Reg. Privy. Council. Scot.*, 1st s., X, 275; XIII, 427, 705-07; 2nd s., VI, xxii.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, VI, 119.

mason, wrote two tributes to the king's Masonic vision. In *A Monument of Mortality upon the Death of Ludovick, Duke of Richmond* (1624), Cleland eulogized his late patron who had died in February 1623. As noted earlier, Ludovick Stuart (Second Duke of Lennox and Richmond) served on the special building commission for St. Paul's and pursued Hermetic studies. As the son of Esmé Stuart, James's youthful favorite, Ludovick was greatly beloved by the king, who read and appreciated *A Monument*. Thus, Cleland's allusions to Cabalistic and alchemical concepts, as well as Egyptian and Hebrew theories of hieroglyphics, reflect his and Ludovick's interest in the traditional occult lore of Scottish Freemasons.¹⁸⁴

In *Jacob's Well and Abbot's Conduit Paralleled* (written in 1624 but published in 1626), Cleland praised a building project undertaken by King James and George Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury. Though a fervent anti-Catholic, Abbot cooperated with James's architectural agenda, and he supervised many ecclesiastical construction efforts. Encouraged by the king, Abbot ordered the building of a great stone water-conduit between two famous churches in Canterbury. The expensive and ornate project provoked criticism from Puritans, who were answered by Cleland in a sermon delivered in the cathedral. The Scot tried to ease local jealousies by comparing the linking of the two churches to the glorious union of Scotland and England; he then compared the intricate architectural design to the building of Solomon's Temple. Cleland praised the geometrical plan of the stonework and the allegorical paintings on the walls, while he argued:

... there was no stone in Salomon's Temple, which was not serviceable to some holy Use, so is there not anything in this Conduit, which is not profitable for our instruction.

The Fabrike or Architecture it selfe is *Monumentum ere perennius*, a Monument more durable than brasse.¹⁸⁵

In order to justify the heraldic devices and symbolic paintings, Cleland pointed to ancient precedent: "For Moses was learned in the doctrine of the Aegyptians; and the Aegyptians themselves figured their mystical doctrine under an Hieroglyphicke of a rainy and over-

¹⁸⁴ See James Cleland, *A Monument of Mortality upon the Death of Ludovick, Duke of Richmond* (London: William Stansby, 1624), 14, 20, 29–32, 46.

¹⁸⁵ James Cleland, *Jacob's Well and Abbot's Conduit Paralleled* (London: Robert Allot, 1626), 47.

cloudy heaven" (an amusing rationale for a water conduit).¹⁸⁶ To reinforce this argument, he cited Apuleius's *Magia*, Cardano's *De Subtilitate*, Reuchlin's *De Cabala*, and physiognomical theory. But, most importantly, architectural monuments serve as "monitors of the mind," and the citizens of Canterbury should be grateful that King James allowed them the benefits of his mental vision.

Meanwhile in London, James faced increasing frustrations with his architectural program. Despite the ambitious plans of the king and Jones to transform Whitehall into a rival of the Escorial, and despite Charles's anger that his name had been omitted from the column at the Escorial, the grand construction project did not progress beyond preliminary drawings.¹⁸⁷ The old king sensed the end of an era, as his health deteriorated and power slipped from his hands. Ailing and depressed, James became increasingly dependent on Buckingham, who collaborated with Charles in transferring policy-making from the king to themselves. The shift in power did not effect Jones, who was often employed by Buckingham on architectural projects. In fact, the relationship of Jones and Buckingham became so close that Sir Henry Wotton, who hoped to receive patronage from the favorite as well as the king and prince, deliberately appealed to their "Masonic" interests by writing *The Elements of Architecture* (1624).

In 1601 Wotton had been sent from Florence to Edinburgh to warn James about a poison plot, and while staying incognito in the palace he became intimate with the king. Thus, he may have learned about James's collaboration with Schaw, who served the king in sensitive diplomatic, architectural, and Masonic affairs.¹⁸⁸ Wotton noted that the Scottish king was obsessed with secrecy, which perhaps influenced his usage of oath-bound Freemasons for personal business. From 1604 to 1611 Wotton served as James's ambassador in Venice, where (possibly influenced by his Scottish contacts) he developed a great admiration for Vitruvian theories and Palladian buildings. He lost the king's favor for several years but was reappointed to Venice in 1616. From then on, he helped Arundel and Buckingham acquire paintings and sculpture from Italy.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., 16.

¹⁸⁷ P. Gregg, *Charles I*, 94.

¹⁸⁸ Logan P. Smith, *The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1907), I, 40-44.

In his correspondence with Buckingham, Wotton discussed architectural theories, offered to send scale models made by local masons, and used architectural terminology to describe the qualities of servants he recommended to the court. Returning to England in November 1623, he launched a campaign to gain the provostship of Eton College. Central to this effort was his publication of *The Elements of Architecture*, which Wotton presumed would gain him the patronage of the royals and Buckingham. In April 1624 he sent the first copy to the king (enclosed letter now lost) and the second to the prince. In an oblique reference to Charles's study of the Escorial, he praised him for having "taken a view of foreign structure."¹⁸⁹ Though Wotton's work was mainly a summary in English of well-known Continental treatises, his emphasis on architecture and masonry as emblematic of the human body and mind points forward to the increasingly speculative development of Freemasonry in the next decades. Or, it is possible that this speculative development was already taking place under the influence of James and Jones.

Quoting Vitruvius, Wotton noted that he "commendeth in an Architect, a Philosophical Spirit; that is, he would have him (as I conceive it) to be no superficial, and floating Artificer; but a Diver into Causes, and into the Mysteries of Proportion." For the architect, "morall Philosophie, which tempereth Fancies, is the Superintendent of Art." Reinforcing the high claims of Jones, Wotton described the relationship of the philosophical architect to the master mason or subordinate worker:

... to choose and sort the materials, for every part of the Fabrique, is a Dutie more proper to a second Superintendent, overall the Under Artizans called (as I take it) by our Author, Offinator lib. 6.cap.11 and in that Place expressly distinguished, from the Architect, whose glory doth more consist, in the Disignement and Idea of the whole Worke, and his truest ambition should be to make the Forme, which is the nobler Part (as it were) triumph over the Matter.¹⁹⁰

Architecture, in turn, is the mistress of painting, sculpture, and other subordinate arts, while all together they become a "a piece of State"—i.e., an instrument of policy.

¹⁸⁹ Sir Henry Wotton, *The Elements of Architecture*, ed. Frederick Hard (1624; facs. rpt. Charlottesville: Virginia UP, 1968), xlviii.

¹⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 21.

Wotton then made a conscious appeal to Scottish national and Masonic traditions when he traced the origins of the "Feasting or enterntayning roome" to the ancient Hebrews, Phoenecians, and Egyptians, "whence all knowledge did flow."¹⁹¹ With this clever support for James's Solomonic Banqueting House, he certainly bolstered his cause. Kerr acquired Wotton's book and evidently used its arguments to solicit support for the king's architectural program.¹⁹² James and Kerr would also have been interested in Wotton's discussion of the Lullist theories of Nicholas of Cusa regarding "the coincidence of extremes" (*coincidentia oppositorum*), which he merged with Vasari's analogy between the beautiful building and a beautiful body:

... the most Scientificall way of Censuring . . . is to passe a running examination over the whole Edifice, according to the properties of a well shapen Man. As wether the wals stand upright upon cleane footing and Foundation; whether the Fabrique bee of a beautifull Stature, whether for the breadth it appeare well burnished, whether the principall Entrance be on the middle Line of the Front or Face, like our Mouthes, whether the Windowes, as our Eyes, be set in equall number and distance on both sides, whether the Offices like the Veines in our Bodies, be usefully distributed . . .¹⁹³

By elevating the moral importance of beauty and proportion in the human as well as architectural body, Wotton obviously hoped to capitalize on the universally recognized beauty and proportion of Buckingham, who would make the final decision on the appointment to Eton. Wotton was aware that in Buckingham's early career, he was praised by Bishop Goodman for being "as inwardly beautiful as he was outwardly."¹⁹⁴ He also knew that James, after returning from Scotland in 1617, had publicly justified his relationship with Buckingham by citing Christian precedents. The king forthrightly told his councillors, who had tried to thwart Buckingham's plans for a brother's marriage, that he was

... a man like other men, who did what other men did, and confessed to loving those he loved . . . And they should be quite clear that he loved the Earl of Buckingham more than any other man, and more than all those who were here present. They should not think of this

¹⁹¹ Ibid., 75.

¹⁹² Kerr's library.

¹⁹³ Henry Wotton, *Elements*, 117.

¹⁹⁴ P. Gregg, *Charles I*, 49.

as a defect in him, for Jesus Christ had done just what he was doing. There could therefore be nothing reprehensible about it, and just as Christ had his John, so he, James, had his George.¹⁹⁵

In 1624, while Wotton was writing *The Elements of Architecture*, Prince Charles also used homophilic language to Buckingham, whom he called "Sweetheart" and himself "your faithful, loving, constant friend."¹⁹⁶ Similar language was used by the naval officer John Pennington, who unembarrassedly wrote that he loved Buckingham, his Lord Admiral, "as a young man doth his mistress, and am jealous of his favour or the contrary." Wotton's architectural perspective on the intimate relationship between Buckingham and James seems much more plausible than the usual modern verdict of homosexuality.¹⁹⁷ Since his 1589 visit to Denmark, James was familiar with Tycho Brahe's belief in passionate friendship or *amicitia*, which the scientist-magus linked with the architectural design and masonic construction of Uraniborg.

As Christianson explains, the cult of *amicitia* had spread throughout Europe, and its roots were in the Renaissance revival of Platonic thought with Pythagorean and Hermetic overtones. For Tycho, ties of *amicitia* were an essential part of his plan for cosmic reform, which would be launched from the "magical talisman" of Uraniborg:

These learned aristocrats and middle-class scholars . . . could point out that the ancient Greeks put family love in the category of *filia*, or filial love, whereas love between friends was *eros*, more intense and full of desire. Tycho and his friends . . . saw [*amicitia*] as a reflection of *amor*, the force that drove the natural universe. Therefore, in order to be in touch with nature, they believed it was necessary to pursue *amicitia*.¹⁹⁸

Like Tycho, James linked his love of symbolic architecture with love of his favorite. Given this background, Wotton's interpretation of the cult of passionate friendship that the king, his son, and a naval officer maintained with Buckingham becomes more comprehensible and sexually "normal."

At the end of his architectural treatise, Wotton had promised a sequel: "Namely, a Philosophical Survey of Education, or repairing

¹⁹⁵ R. Lockyer, *Buckingham*, 43.

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 195, 233–34, 303.

¹⁹⁷ In *Great Britain's Solomon* (Urbana: Illinois UP, 1990), 248, Maurice Lee argues convincingly against a homosexual relationship between James and Buckingham.

¹⁹⁸ R. Christianson, *Tycho's Island*, 44.

of Nature, and, as I may tearme it, a kinde of Morall Architecture."¹⁹⁹ Though he did not complete it before the king's death, his retrospective view of James's attitude to Buckingham is fraught with Masonic resonance:

James resolved to make him a Master-piece, and to mould him, as it were, Platonically to his own *Idea*. Neither was his Majesty content only to be the architect of his fortune, without putting his Gracious hand likewise to some part of the work itself.²⁰⁰

Though some modern critics interpret Wotton's reference to the "hand" as a sly reference to homosexual contact, he would never have risked such a remark in a work seeking the patronage of king and duke. Moreover, a similar Masonic philosophy of moral architecture and Platonic friendship would be expressed (and enacted) by Sir Robert Moray, Gilbert Burnet, and John Evelyn later in the century. No more than with King James and his favorites should we anachronistically assume that their *amicitia* was merely carnal.²⁰¹

Through spring and summer 1624, James watched helplessly as his son and favorite joined the Puritan war party and pursued an aggressively militaristic diplomacy against Catholic Spain.²⁰² While his health deteriorated, the king was saddened by the rejection of his pacific policies. Though many of his English subjects seemed to scorn his Solomonic ambitions, the Scottish courtier Kerr continued to support them. In 1624 Kerr sent to his son William, then in Paris, his translation from the Hebrew of David's psalms, in the hope that it would aid religious reconciliation.²⁰³ When William moved on to Italy, he followed his father's advice to record his architectural observations, and he was especially impressed by the spiralled pillars in St. Peter's, which he noted "were brought from Solomon's Temple."

Curiously, one Jewish writer believed that James had fulfilled his Solomonic ambitions. In March 1625 Paul Jacob, recently converted

¹⁹⁹ H. Wotton, *Elements*, 122.

²⁰⁰ Henry Wotton, *Reliquiae Wottonianae*, 3rd. rev. ed., ed. Izaak Walton (London, 1672), 209–10.

²⁰¹ See D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 174, 178, 182–89; also, "Masonry, Symbolism, and Ethics in the Life of Sir Robert Moray, FRS," *Proceedings of the Society of Scottish Antiquaries*, 114 (1984), 405–31. For a revisionist view of James's political, rather than erotic, motivations in his usage of favorites, see N. Cuddy, "Anglo-Scottish Union," 107–24.

²⁰² D. Willson, *James VI and I*, 443.

²⁰³ R. Kerr, *Correspondence*, I, xlv–viii.

to Christianity by an Irish bishop, sent a strange petition to the king. He considered "that as the sceptre has passed from Judah, his Majesty is the true King of the Jews."²⁰⁴ Jacob therefore claimed that he was now James's child and subject. Unfortunately for Jacob, the king died on 27 March, and we do not know what he thought of his new role. However, Jacob's tribute foreshadows the loyalty of many Jews—and Jewish Freemasons—to the Stuarts in the troubled decades ahead.

As the Elizabethan war party revived, James's loyal supporters determined to remind his English subjects that Scotland's Solomon had served them well. Chancellor Hay travelled from Scotland to attend the funeral, and he would personally adopt James's Solomonic symbolism in his own architecture and masonry.²⁰⁵ In Northampton John Thorpe, long-time master mason to Thomas Tresham, carved on the wall of Aston Hall a large niche for sculptures representing the Jewish kings David and Solomon. The iconography was that of James I, the "new David" and "Great Britain's Salomon."²⁰⁶ To honor his late patron, Inigo Jones designed a magnificent catafalque, and Bishop John Williams prepared a two-hour funeral sermon that defended the king's Solomonic and Masonic virtues to a confused and violent world. Williams, who had replaced the disgraced Francis Bacon as chancellor, shared James's interest in the construction and restoration of churches. His sermon, *Great Britain's Salomon*, revealed how profoundly James's Scottish Masonic vision had effected at least some of his English subjects.

According to Williams, during James's reign London had become Jerusalem and Great Britain had become Israel, which flourished for forty years under the wise rule of Solomon. Drawing on the architectural descriptions of Josephus, Serlio, Montano, and Villalpando, Williams affirmed that Jerusalem was "the goodliest Theatre of the East; it was not only a citie . . . but a Type, and a Figure of all other Cities."²⁰⁷ It was the architectural expertise of Israel's king which made Jerusalem into a universal archetype. He then exhorted the mourners, "You know best, that no booke will serve this turne, but

²⁰⁴ *CSP. Domestic. James I*, XI, 517.

²⁰⁵ D. Howard, "Kinnoul Aisle," 38, 41–49.

²⁰⁶ Oliver Fairclough, "John Thorpe and Aston Hall," *AH*, 32 (1989), 37.

²⁰⁷ Bishop John Williams, *Great Britain's Salomon* (London: Job Bill, 1625), 22–24, 38–39, 47, 62.

the Booke of Kings." Quoting the verses most revered in Masonic tradition, Williams continued: "Salomon was a maine Improver of his home commodities, as you may see in his trading with Hiram, *I Kings* 5:9 verse; and, God knowes it was the daily study of King James." "Solomon beautified very much his capital cities with Buildings, and Water-workes, *I Kings* 9:15. So did King James." Williams repeated the last Biblical citation and urged his audience to read "the Proclamations for Buildings for his [James'] work in enlarging and repairing cities." In the cited chapters from scripture, the collaboration between Solomon and Hiram of Tyre in quarrying and hewing stone is stressed. Finally, James's efforts to build up the church replicated Solomon's building of the Temple.

Like Solomon, James acquired a universal wisdom that embraced all sciences. Like the ancient Egyptians, his subjects should wrap and preserve his body in glass for future generations, because the king learned "to study out those Egyptian Hieroglyphickes in the Hearts of Men." Though James ordered a new translation of the Bible in order to counter the Papists, he was a moderate king whose motto was "Blessed are the Peacemakers." With his peace came prosperity, for the internationalist monarch encouraged trade. Then, in a striking image, Williams affirmed that "now all the ports are opened to our red Crosses." In his citations from *I Kings*, the bishop stressed the role of Hiram of Tyre in boosting the trade of Solomon's Israel. For those Freemasons who supported the ideals of the Rosicrucian Enlightenment, the bishop's allusion to the red crosses must have seemed fraught with "hieroglyphicke" portent.

CHAPTER SEVEN

ROSICRUCIAN VISION AND THE MASON WORD: TO BUILD OR BREAK BRIDGES ACROSS RELIGIOUS DIVIDES? (1625–1640)

Upon his Demise, his Son King Charles I. being also a Mason, patroniz'd Mr. Jones too, and firmly intended to have carried on his Royal Father's Design of White-Hall, according to Mr. Jones' Stile; but was unhappily diverted by the Civil Wars.

—James Anderson, *Constitutions of the Freemasons* (1723)

For we be brethren of the *Rosie Crosse*,
We have the *Mason word*, and second sight,
Things for to come we can foretell aright.
And shall we show what misterie we mean,
In fair acrosticks *Carolus Rex* is seen . . .

—Henry Adamson, *The Muses Threnodie* (1638)

After the death of his pacifist father, King Charles I determined to revive the Puritan war policy advocated by his late brother Henry. In the process, he brought Britain into closer contact with the Rosicrucian millenarianism that fueled the European crusade against the Papacy and Hapsburg Empire. By the time Charles recognized the wisdom of James's pacific policy (after four years of fruitless warfare), he would learn that his flirtation with militant Protestantism had set in motion forces that would eventually destroy the Solomonic dreams of the Stuart dynasty. At the same time, he would see the institution of Freemasonry split into rival factions, as initiates of the Temple struggled with the divisive issues of the British civil wars.

Stung by the failure of Spain to support the restoration of the Palatinate, Charles and Buckingham implemented a policy of war against Spain and Austria—a policy supported by a strong majority in Parliament. As Lord Admiral of the fleet, Buckingham worked closely with naval architects in the construction of new ships, while Charles continued his obsessive studies of the military-mathematical arts of fortification, encampment, and troop deployment.¹ Many of

¹ P. Gregg, *Charles I*, 34.

these labors and skills came under the provenance of operative masonry, and king and duke collaborated with the architects Jones and Gerbier in their political as well as masonic endeavors. Hoping to gain French support for his war policy, Charles was betrothed to Henriette Marie, daughter of Henri IV and Marie de Médicis. Like his Stuart predecessors, Charles utilized his architects in important confidential missions, and Gerbier accompanied Buckingham to Paris to finalize the marriage and to escort Henriette to London. The adolescent bride soon found comfort in friendship with Inigo Jones, who resumed construction of her Catholic chapel at Somerset House—despite Puritan criticism of her Papist entourage.

Determined to carry on the architectural agenda of his father, Charles appointed a building commission in May 1625 which had broad powers to enforce building with brick and stone and to tear down shoddy and dangerous constructions.² He worked closely with Jones, and he enjoyed learning the professional secrets of the architect and his craftsmen.³ It was perhaps at this time that Charles was initiated into Freemasonry; according to Anderson, he was “a Royal Brother and Grand Master by Prerogative.”⁴ On 19 June Bishop Laud preached before the court a sermon that reinforced the image of Charles as a “Mason King.” Drawing on Montano’s interpretation of Psalm 75:2–3, Laud portrayed Charles as a stone pillar that upholds the national Temple, despite efforts by schismatics to dissolve and melt down the edifice. Those who murmur and make the people believe there are cracks in the pillars, who disesteem their strength, and who undervalue their bearing can send them falling.⁵ Then, changing his metaphor, he chastised those carping critics who forget that human kings are not stony nor insensible but living and understanding pillars, who share the plight of their countrymen. With this royalist masonic language, Laud greatly pleased the king.

While overseeing architectural affairs in London, Charles also paid close attention to masonic affairs in Scotland. On 25 July he urged the Scottish Privy Council to fund the rebuilding of the bridge at Perth, reminding them that the cause had been dear to his father’s

² J. Gotch, *Inigo Jones*, 138–41.

³ R. Smuts, *Court Culture*, 158.

⁴ J. Anderson, *Constitutions (1738)*, 99.

⁵ W. Laud, *Works*, I, 105–07.

heart.⁶ He then ratified the appointment of James Murray as Master of Works, and his position entailed the high prestige and broad authority of Schaw and Jones.⁷ At this time, Murray, Wallace, and their master masons developed a uniquely Scottish expression of royalist sentiment, when they designed and carved “Renaissance buckle quoins” as “a tidy but decorative way of turning corners on a harled building.”⁸ The quoins appeared only on houses of distinction owned by men close to the court, and they continued to signal attachment to the Stuarts over the next turbulent decades. Mackechnie suggests that Freemasonry provided the common link between these patrons and clients.

In London Laud made another masonic contribution to Charles’s political, religious, and architectural agenda. On 6 February 1626 he preached at the opening of Parliament. Taking Psalm 122:3–5 as his text, he expatiated on the theme that “Jerusalem is builded as a city, that is at unity in itself.”⁹ Calling upon the M.P.s to support their Davidic-Solomonic king, Laud affirmed that Jerusalem stands here in the letter for the city, and in type and figure for the State and the Church of Christ. Like the ancient Jews, they owe service not only to the king but to the priests of the Temple: “Therefore here to ease the ‘pillars,’ God hath built up buttresses, if men do not pull them down, to stay the main walls of both buildings.” Faction and sedition in the kingdom can undermine the foundation of the Temple rebuilt by Christ: “The building cracks presently. And continue it cannot long, if the great master-builders take not care of the mortar. If it be laid with ‘untempered,’ or ‘distempered mortar,’ all will be naught.” He then compared the hewing of stone to the Jewish rite of circumcision, and he called for a “paring off round about of heated and unruly affections in the handling of differences.”

In a courageously irenic statement, he affirmed that “It were happy if all States, Christian especially, were at unity in themselves and with their neighbors,” so the “course of this world may be so peaceably ordered.” He then explained that “My text is nothing but a most deserved praise of Jerusalem. And not of the particular mate-

⁶ *Reg. Privy. Council. Scot.*, 2nd s., I.

⁷ D. Howard, *Scottish Architecture*, 37.

⁸ Aonghus Mac Kechnie, “Evidence of a Post-1603 Court Architecture in Scotland,” *AH*, 31 (1988), 107–18.

⁹ W. Laud, *Works*, I, 63–75.

rial Jerusalem alone, but of any State, of any Church, that is as Jerusalem then was, and that doth as Jerusalem then did." Laud compared the king's determination to achieve architectural uniformity and beauty in London with that of the citizens of Jerusalem while the Temple stood:

For the beauty and artificial joining of the houses is expressed but as a type of this unity; when men dwell as near in affection as their houses stand in place.

It is a great ornament of a city that the buildings be fair, that they stand not scattering, as if they were afraid of each other. But where-soever it is so, the city is beholding to unity for it. Let the citizens break their unity once, they will spend so much in quarrels that they cannot build the city. No other times but when the inhabitants are at peace can build; nor no other time can keep them from waste.¹⁰

Unfortunately, when the Jews became divided, they became so vulnerable that they lost their Temple:

Thus it was with Jerusalem of old when she lost her unity. For faction within the walls was a help to Titus, and his siege without. And long after, when the Christians had won it from the Saracens, their own divisions among themselves to their loss and shame let in Saladin, the Soldan of Egypt.

Laud's appeal for religious moderation was triggered by increasing Puritan and Presbyterian agitation for a military campaign to aid the king's sister, the Winter Queen of Bohemia. At this time, the piteous plight of refugees from the Palatinate and Bohemia provoked demands from Continental Protestants for stronger British contributions to the war effort. Proclaiming loyalty to Elizabeth Stuart, many Scots called for increasing commitment to the militant Protestant crusade against the Papacy. Some English courtiers reported, with distaste, the "new world of Scottishmen come—thirty lords in the court at once," who not only demanded that the king travel to Scotland to be crowned but that Scots rather than English ("because more hardy") be recruited to fight for the Palatinate.¹¹ Encouraged by Presbyterian preachers (who "are growing into a combustion"), many Scottish nobles banded together to resist any attempt by

¹⁰ Ibid., I, 65.

¹¹ [T. Birch], *The Court and Times of Charles I* (London: Henry Colburn, 1848), I, 24, 40, 72–78, 130.

Catholics to assume positions in their government. Chancellor Hay, reappointed by Charles, became so discrete about his own beliefs that he could only be accused of "high church proclivities."¹²

On 22 March 1626 Patrick Hume wrote to Robert Kerr about the religious turbulence in Scotland, which threatened to destroy the "Temple" of Stuart governance:

And now, "time is that judgement should begin at the house of God" . . . when any Levite may be a priest, etc. Corruption in Counsel is much prejudicial to a common weal; but corruption in the Kirk much more impediment both to Christ his kingdom, and his viceregent King Charles. God gave his Majesty that same mind that was in King David, Salomon, Ezechias, Josias, etc.; yea, and Cyrus (God's Shepherd) . . . who, for reedification of the Temple, commanded all things in the house of God to be done according to the commandment of God, that they might pray for the King and his children . . .¹³

As an advocate of pacific Rosicrucianism, Kerr must have been disturbed by the flood of radical publications from Holland, which increasingly linked the Palatinate cause with militaristic Rosicrucianism.

In London an explosion of popular news mongering about the religious struggles abroad provoked Ben Jonson to new satire. For Jonson, the irrationality of Rosicrucian utopianism was linked to the architectural pretensions of Jones. Shortly after Charles's coronation in February 1626, Jonson wrote *The Staple of News*, which targeted the profusion of pamphlets reporting millenarian prophecies and anti-Papist fantasies about the war in Germany. He made a provocative allusion to the still unpublished *Naometria* of Simon Studion, which he defined as "The Measuring of the Temple: a Cabal/Found out lately, and set out by Archie," the king's Scottish jester.¹⁴ Was Jonson aware of combined Rosicrucian-Masonic studies among Charles's courtiers? He first ridiculed the study of "Magick, or Alchimy,/Or flying i' the ayre" (a reference to Damian, James IV's flying alchemist), which he linked with the current Rosicrucians in Germany:

Cla. They write from Libtzig (reverence to your eares)
The Art of drawing farts out of dead bodies,
Is by the Brotherhood of the Rosie Crosse,
Produc'd unto perfection, in so sweet

¹² D. Howard, "Kinnoul Aisle," 18, 50.

¹³ R. Kerr, *Correspondence*, I, 42. Spelling modernized.

¹⁴ B. Jonson, *Jonson*, II, 177; VI, 149.

And rich a tincture—*Fit*. As there is no Princesse,
But may perfume her chamber with th'extraction.¹⁵

Jonson seemed annoyed by the favored position of Rosicrucian defenders—such as Fludd, Kerr, and Ramsay—at court. He repeated, with minor changes, his charges made earlier in *Neptune's Triumph* about the linkage of militant Rosicrucian and presumptuous architect. The Vitruvian master-cook pretends to expertise in the arts of military masonry, while he also claims alchemical prowess, like the “airy brethren of the Rosie-crosse.”¹⁶ Jonson's anger was further fueled by the growing status of Gerbier, another architect who was designing weapons and fortifications for Buckingham's military campaigns. That the poet had reservations about the new regime's war policy is suggested by his question about the Spanish conqueror of the Palatinate: “But what if Spinola have a new Project:/To bring an army over in corke-shooes,/And land them, here at Harwich?” Small wonder that *The Staple of News* received a hostile response from its courtly audience who, as Jonson complained, made “so sinister an interpretation” of his comedy.

Throughout 1626 King Charles demonstrated his sympathy for various Rosicrucian enterprises. In February he wrote to the Czar of Russia to praise the services rendered by Dr. Arthur Dee to his late mother and to recommend the continuance of the Czar's favor to the physician.¹⁷ In July Fludd, who continued to receive royal patronage, published *Philosophia Sacra*, the third volume of his history of the microcosm, which dealt with meteorology and cosmology. In the autumn William Vaughan dedicated *The Golden Fleece* to Charles, who evidently gave a sympathetic reading to its explicitly Rosicrucian proposals.¹⁸ In Vaughan's treatise, there was also an important link with the king's Scottish courtiers.

An eccentric and mystical Welshman, Vaughan was influenced by the works of Dionysius the Areopagite, Lull, Paracelsus, Ficino, and Du Bartas. He had also translated and presented to Charles the *Ragguagli di Parnasso* by Boccacini, which was currently linked with the Rosicrucian *Fama*. While writing on medical and moral matters,

¹⁵ Ibid., VI, 331.

¹⁶ Ibid., VI, 348, 330; II, 170.

¹⁷ J. Appleby, “Arthur Dee,” 98–100.

¹⁸ “William Vaughan,” *DNB*; R. Heisler, “Rosicrucian,” 44–45.

Vaughan was deeply invested in the colonial plantation of Newfoundland. In spring 1626 he attended court in London in order to learn “the king’s pleasure” about the fishing fleet and plantations in the New World.¹⁹ He was interviewed by Sir William Alexander, master of requests and secretary for Scotland, who was similarly invested in the plantation of Nova Scotia. Alexander spoke eloquently about the over-population and poverty of Scotland, which he hoped to relieve through the colonial projects, though there were still insufficient funds to implement the improving schemes. James had earlier persuaded the Livery Companies of London to invest in the plantations, and the Company of Masons made steady contributions to the venture.²⁰ At the same time, the masons contributed funds for the campaign of the “King of Bohemia,” which continued to have Rosicrucian overtones.

Vaughan communicated to Alexander his similar concerns about the poverty of Wales, and they discussed their shared interest in gold and silver mining. That Alexander had unusual contacts with German metallurgists suggests mutual Rosicrucian sympathies between the two colonialists.²¹ Vaughan came away from the meeting determined to write a tract that would convince the king, Privy Council, and City companies to increase support for the ventures. He accordingly devised an elegant fable in which Rosicrucian emissaries reveal the secret of the Golden Fleece that will restore Britain’s decayed trade. Alexander was also interested in architecture, and he seemed to be familiar with Freemasonry. Given the Scottish masons’ stress on the Art of Memory, he perhaps influenced Vaughan to make Mnemosyne, the Goddess of Memory, the introducer of the Rosicrucian messengers to the king:

... the lady Mnemosyne brought his Maiestie word, that four grave personages were newly arrived at this Court Gate, stiling themselves the Fraternitie of the Rosie Crosse. At the first he seemed to slight the newes, thinking they might be some of those Cabalisticall Mountebankes, who went abroad ... making credulous persons to believe, that they were of a Mathematicall fry, and race of wise Philosophers, to whom Mercurius Trismegistus had transferred the never erring Art

¹⁹ William Vaughan, *The Golden Fleece* (London: Franklin Williams, 1626), part I, 1–24.

²⁰ E. Conder, *Hole Craft*, 131, 147.

²¹ Charles Rogers, *Memorials of the Earl of Stirling and of the House of Alexander* (Edinburgh: William Paterson, 1877), 35, 45.

of discerning Truth from falsehood, the means to unite the variable will of man, and that which Worldlings most prize, to make the Philosopher's Stone.²²

When the king better understood that the Rosicrucians represented "the foure famous Patrones of Great Brittaines Monarchie" (the saints George, Andrew, David, and Patrick), he welcomed them and confided "the causes of his late discontent." Saint George explains that his sadness is caused by the vices and decays of Great Britain. He and the other brothers convince the king to join them in a procession to consecrate the churches and regenerate men's morality. Though Vaughan assured the reader that he was not a Puritan, his Rosicrucian spokesmen present a lengthy catalogue of the vanities and vices that have produced the degenerate state of the kingdom. One target was the opposition to Charles's military campaign to restore the Palatinate—those citizens who prefer "Peace with danger/To Just War."²³ After the Rosicrucians sing "an applauding *Allelulah* to the Divine Maiestie," they urge him to proclaim a favorable edict "on behalf of their penitent clients," and the king then vows to imitate Hercules in the cleaning of his stables.

In the final section of the treatise, Vaughan became more specific in his proposals for Newfoundland ("our Colchos"), asking the king to confirm "the commission and orders, which his Father of blessed memory granted" several years ago. This appeal was to be presented to "Lady Pallas" (the queen) and "other vertuous persons his Favorites" (Buckingham, Jones, etc.). Noting that Alexander backed this proposal, Vaughan then presented the practical projects necessary to restore decayed trade (establishment of fishing fleets, sheep farmers, wool and textile industries, etc.) in terms of Rosicrucian symbolism:

... the Golden Fleece which the fraternitie of the rosie crosse insinuated to his Maiestie, was parti-coloured like the Rainebow, so produced by the Patriarch Jacobs Art, according to the severall objects represented, and likewise divided into the Naturall, the Artificiall, and the Mysticall... yet all of them comprehended under one general name, *viz*, Trading.²⁴

It is possible that Alexander and Vaughan were aware of a real Rosicrucian who was then resident in London. Moreover, it was

²² W. Vaughan, *Golden Fleece*, part II, 85–86.

²³ *Ibid.*, part II, 91, 101.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, part III, 81.

another Scot, the king's clock-maker David Ramsay, who acted as an intermediary between the mysterious visitor and the court. Philip Ziegler, the self-proclaimed "king of Jerusalem" and "sceptre of the kings in Zion," had been expelled from Nüremberg and then visited Sweden, where he reportedly contacted Rosicrucian millenarians.²⁵ In 1625 Ziegler arrived in England from Holland, where he had organized Rosicrucian colleges before the ban issued by the court of justice.²⁶ While living incognito in London, Ziegler was perhaps inspired by the publication of Vaughan's Rosicrucian treatise to propose his own more radical Rosicrucian program. Claiming that he possessed royal Scottish blood, he exercised a charismatic influence over Ramsay, whom he utilized in late autumn 1626 to appeal to the court to hear his militantly millenarial plan.

On 25 November the court-observer Pory reported that the Rosicrucian would send a child as his messenger:

... a certain heteroclite ambassador is coming upon the stage. A youth he is, as I hear, with never a hair on his face; and of the principal by whom he is sent, and whom he is to represent, lies concealed in this town: and in one word, to solve this riddle, is President of the Rosy Cross; whose said ambassador, on Sunday afternoon, hath appointed to come to court, with thirteen coaches. The proffers he is to make his majesty are no small ones; to wit—if his majesty will follow his advice, he will presently put three millions, viz., thirty thousand pounds, into his coffers, and will teach him a way to suppress the Pope; how to advance his own religion all over Christendom; and lastly, how to convert Turks and Jews to Christianity...²⁷

On 26 November Pory further reported:

The young ambassador of our President of the Rosy Cross did not appear this afternoon at Whitehall; but, they say, he proffereth his three millions, to be paid in May next. We all fear he will prove but a mountebank, and his project a second *England's Joy*. He sent a let-

²⁵ S. Akerman, *Rose Cross*, 129, 131–32; Ron Heisler, "Phillip Ziegler—the Rosicrucian 'King of Jerusalem,'" *HJ* (1990), 3–10. I differ from their identification of David Ramsay as the radical Presbyterian who was exiled for treason in 1632 and joined the Swedish army. The case is much stronger for the clockmaker Ramsay, who definitely had Rosicrucian interests and access to the king. It was the latter Ramsay who joined the Masonic lodge at Edinburgh in 1637.

²⁶ R. Heisler, "Rosicrucianism," 52.

²⁷ Pory's report sent by Rev. Joseph Mead to Sir Martin Stuteville (25 November 1626); reprinted in [T. Birch], *Court*, II, 173–75.

ter to the king . . . His name, they say, is Philipus Ishbertus; and his ambassador's or messenger's (which is but a youth), Origenes.

That the Rosicrucian mission was associated with Palatinate politics was made clear on 27 November, when another courtier wrote:

There is a stranger hath been two years in London, and some say is the same, who . . . told the Prince Palatine, at the beginning of his election to the crown of Bohemia, of all the misfortunes and calamities which have befallen him since that time, and nevertheless advised him to accept it. Whosoever he be, he yesterday sent a letter to our king, by David Ramsay, a copy whereof we took from the original, immediately after he had been with the king. He gave Mr. Ramsay further instructions, as to tell his majesty that, if he be pleased to grant him allowance, he would send this next Sunday and impart things to his majesty of moment and secresy; and that he would impart it by the mouth of a young child, whom he had already anointed, and such like . . .²⁸

As rumors swirled about the still-concealed Ziegler, enemies of Buckingham tried to exploit the situation in order to add fresh charges against the embattled favorite. On 2 December Reverend Joseph Mead recorded:

For the Rosy Cross President you shall see his ambassador appeared not at the time appointed . . . It seems his majesty would not give him an audience. You shall see here his letter to the king. The contents methinks argue it comes from some whose brains croak. It is said here, that the king should say, if he could tell where to find him, unless he made good his proffer of gold, he would hang him up at the court gates; whereby it seems he is latent and undiscovered, and meant to be so, but use a child for his minister and messenger, whose innocence and age might secure him from his usage, as himself the principal, was like to find. Some think it is somebody whose brains are cracked. Others a plot to have got access unto the king in private for discovery of some matter against the duke [Buckingham] . . .²⁹

Despite Ramsay's efforts, Parliament ordered the arrest of Ziegler and the seizure of his papers, which were analysed for their "Anabaptisticall Dreams." The exposure of Ziegler as an "impostor" was especially devastating to Adam Boreel, a young Dutch millenarian then studying in England. According to Ramsay's nephew John Dury,

²⁸ Ibid., II, 175.

²⁹ Ibid., II, 178.

Boreel had a great "affection" for Ziegler, but "it cost him dear for he was free of his purse with him till he was found out."³⁰ Boreel's negative experience with the Rosicrucian "king of Jerusalem" did not diminish his fervor for converting the Jews, and he would devote the rest of his life to Hebrew studies with Jews and Christian Hebraists in Holland.³¹ Like Ramsay's, his efforts would later have Masonic ramifications. When the Winter Queen intervened on Ziegler's behalf, Charles I acquiesced to his sister's request and ordered his release. In 1627 Charles himself intervened to save the painter Torrentius, who had come to England after being arrested in Holland for Rosicrucian activities.³² Though Torrentius was accused of belonging to the atheistic Rosicrucian sect, corrupting the young, and practising black magic, he was allowed to live in London for several years.

It was probably no coincidence that Francis Bacon's *New Atlantis*, with its Rosicrucian themes, was posthumously published in 1627—in the wake of Vaughan's colonization treatise and Ziegler's millenarian manifesto. Bacon's fable was probably written circa 1614–17 during the first flush of Rosicrucian enthusiasm. Vaughan, who dedicated his *Directions for Health* to Bacon in 1617, may have seen the manuscript. In *The New Atlantis* Bacon appealed to James's Solomonic ideals when he proposed "a college instituted for the interpreting of nature and the producing of great and marvellous works for the benefit of men, under the name of Salomon's House, or the College of the Six Days' Works."³³ In the fable, a party of English explorers on their way to Peru are driven by a storm to an island called the New Atlantis or Bensalem. The strangers are presented with a scroll signed with "a stamp of cherubins' wings, not spread but hanging downwards, and by them a cross," and they are welcomed by the governor of the House of Strangers who wears a white turban with "a small red cross on top." Yates argues that Bacon took the

³⁰ *The Hartlib Papers*, University of Sheffield, Electronic Edition (Ann Arbor: UMI, 1995), 3/3/32A (Dury to Hartlib, 31 August 1646).

³¹ Richard Popkin, "Hartlib, Dury, and the Jews," in Mark Greengrass, Michael Leslie, and Timothy Raylor, eds., *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994), 121–33.

³² Rudolph and Margot Wittkower, *Born Under Saturn* (New York: Random House, 1963), 31; S. Akerman, *Rose Cross*, 145. Torrentius's real name was Jan Symonsz van der Beek.

³³ For the date, see "Francis Bacon," *DNB*; F. Bacon, *Advancement and New Atlantis*, Dr. William Rawley's preface, 214–18.

imagery of wings and cross from Rosicrucian tracts and that the islanders' policy of free medical treatment, incognito travel, and angelic magic paralleled that of the *Fama* and *Confessio*.³⁴

However, it seems possible that Bacon also drew on Masonic motifs for his utopia. Slawinski observes that "the various Chambers and Galleries of Bacon's House of Salomon are reminiscent of memory places," suggesting a link between the Art of Memory and the natural sciences.³⁵ This was precisely the link made by William Schaw and his Scottish masons. In *The New Atlantis*, the "red cross" governor revealed that twenty years after the ascension of Christ, certain inhabitants of the island saw a great pillar of light, in the form of a column with a blazing cross on top, rising from the sea towards heaven. One of "the wise men of the society of Salomon's House" sailed out to observe the pillar and cross and then prayed to God: "thou hast vouchsafed of thy grace to those of our order, to know thy works of creation, and the secrets of them; and to discern . . . between divine miracles, works of nature, works of art, and impostures and illusions of all sorts."³⁶ The wise man begs God to interpret the sign, but as he approaches nearer the column it disappears, leaving a floating ark of cedar, which contains a book of all known and missing parts of the Bible and a letter from the apostle Barnabas. Inspired by this secret knowledge, the Bensalemites build a "magnificent temple" on a hill, to which men ascend by "several degrees" as if it were "a *scala coeli*." For Bacon's intended reader, the "Mason King" James I, these passages would seem to echo the Temple mysticism, with its pillars of Jachin and Boaz and spiritual ladder, revealed in the craftsmen's lodges. The founder king of Bensalem was Solamona, who possessed the lost scientific and magical works of the Hebrew Solomon.

So far, *The New Atlantis* fits in with other contemporary panegyrics to Great Britain's Solomon. However, when Bacon described the Feast of the Family and the universalist religious aims of Solomon's House, he seemed to draw on Familist doctrines. Linking the Rosicrucian, Familist, and Masonic themes is Joabin the Jew, who admires Jesus and is a loyal citizen of Bensalem. Joabin reveals that the local Jews descended from Abraham's son Nachoran and "that

³⁴ F. Yates, *Rosicrucian*, 127–28.

³⁵ M. Slawinski, "Rhetoric," 87.

³⁶ F. Bacon, *Advancement*, 222–23.

Moses by a secret cabala ordained the laws of Bensalem.”³⁷ Praising the function of the Feast of the Family, the narrator asks Joabin to explain the customs of “nuptial copulation” maintained by the Bensalemites. The Jew answers with a diatribe against the sexual promiscuity and homosexuality of Europe, while he hints at the sacramental sexuality of the Cabala—“the Spirit of Chastity of Bensalem” appears as “a fair beautiful Cherubin.”

Joabin then honors the strangers by introducing them to the Father of Salomon’s House, who lays out the kind of detailed scientific research agenda that became known as “Baconian.” According to Feuer, Bacon modelled Joabin on a contemporary Jew, the brilliant mining engineer Joachim Gaunse, who revolutionized England’s copper mining industry before falling foul of anti-Semitic and xenophobic persecution during Elizabeth’s reign.³⁸ Bacon was aware of James’s desire to recruit foreign artisans in order to stimulate technological and architectural progress, and he probably knew of James’s sympathy for Jacob Barnet, the Jew who earlier instructed Casaubon but fell foul of the Calvinists at Oxford. Given later Stuart-Jewish collaboration within Freemasonry, this early linkage by Bacon is significant. Among Bensalem’s “Merchants of Light,” there are three who “collect the experiments of all mechanical arts, liberal sciences, and practices which are not brought into arts.”³⁹ These are called “Mystery-men,” while there are also “novices and apprentices” who take an oath of secrecy “for the concealing of those [inventions and experiments] which we think fit to keep secret.”

Bacon did not finish the *New Atlantis*, and it is possible that Joabin’s harsh criticism of the lax sexual morality of “Europe” hit too close to home for James’s courtiers. In writing a similar reformist treatise for Charles’s courtiers, Vaughan was careful to maintain a light tone and to avoid the taint of Puritanism. However, James was aware of Bacon’s pansophic project, and he was sympathetic to his proposals for colleges of learning.⁴⁰ James’s efforts to establish a Baconian Royal Academy in 1621 and 1624 were resisted by Parliament, which also

³⁷ Ibid., 234–35.

³⁸ Lewis Feuer, “Francis Bacon and the Jews: Who was the Jew in the *New Atlantis*,” *TJHSE*, 29 (1982–86), 1–25.

³⁹ F. Bacon, *Advancement*, 245–46.

⁴⁰ Ethel Portal, “The Academ Roial of King James I,” *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 7 (1915–16), 189–208.

rejected Charles's effort in 1626. In the proposals, James and then his son were presented as Solomon, who patronized "the magnificent handling of magnificent knowledges." In Charles's program, architecture and the plastic arts were included as objects of study. By 1627 Bacon's *New Atlantis* received a more sympathetic reading from Robert Kerr, who also admired the late chancellor's *Advancement of Learning*.⁴¹ At this time, a "re-presentation of the full idea" of the Royal Academy was made via Buckingham.⁴² To reinforce the proposal, which echoed Vaughan's argument, Sir William Alexander appended a commendatory poem. Unfortunately, Charles I's increasing difficulties with Parliament meant that none of these ambitious projects—Vaughan's Golden Fleece, Bacon's House of Solomon, Buckingham's Royal Academy—could be realized.

The king's personal interest in such "Rosicrucian" schemes alarmed Stephen Denison, kinsman of the John Denison who had served as chaplain to Buckingham and James I. Stephen seemed to draw on inside knowledge of court affairs when he issued *The White Wolf* (1627), in order to warn Charles about the Rosicrucians, Familists, and other secretive conventicles in England. Arguing that princes "must not give any toleration to Idolatry in the Lords Land," he described the "Severall Kinds of Mystical Wolves Breeding in England."⁴³ He then lumped together the "deified or rather diabolized Familists," "Anabaptisticall Wolves," "Rosey-Crosse-wolves," and "Arminian Wolves, which make a bridge between us and Popery." That the Puritans identified Arminians with Laudians meant that Denison was taking risky shots at the king's favorite churchmen.

After charging that the Anabaptistical wolves "jumpe with the Arminians," he targeted the Rosicrucians:

I would we had not Rosey-Crosse Wolves which turn Divinity into phansies, & see idle speculations of their owne braine, esteeming text-men, or such as endeavour to keep to the natural sense of the Scripture . . . to bee vulgar Divines, as they inculcate in some of their fancifull bookes; boasting also of their ability to worke such miracles as I should tremble to name: but because they do this more privately;

⁴¹ Kerr's library.

⁴² D. Dickson, *Tessera*, 8n.19. I disagree with Dickson's dating of 1630, for Buckingham was killed in 1628; the marginal note about Alexander, "Now, Lord Viscount STERLING" was probably added later.

⁴³ Stephen Denison, *The White Wolfe* (London: George Miller, 1627), 6, 22, 37.

being rather ashamed or affraid it should come to light, I passe it by for the present.⁴⁴

Denison's final target was the "Familisticall Wolves," whom he divided into various factions and portrayed as spread around Britain. Though they conformed outwardly to the Church of England, they worked for spiritual illumination, allegorized the Scriptures, expected salvation from their own works, and—worst of all—held that Turks and Pagans can be saved. To his dismay, Denison's warnings were ignored by Charles and Laud.

While Charles tolerated and even patronized students of Rosicrucianism, he also determined to strengthen the hierarchical structure and to unify the external ceremonies of the Church of England. For courtiers like Fludd and Kerr, there was no conflict between private Rosicrucian beliefs and public profession of Anglicanism. Unfortunately, Charles would soon learn that the situation was more complicated in Scotland. His well-intentioned effort to increase the endowment of the Scottish clergy provoked resentment among those nobles who had profited from their acquisition of church properties. When Charles revoked all dispositions of ecclesiastical property and offered compensation to the secular owners, many of the lords refused to comply.⁴⁵ Their defiance encouraged an outpouring of anti-Papist propaganda from Presbyterian preachers, who feared further intrusion of Anglican religious practices into the national kirk. By late 1626 the situation had become so tense that Archibald Napier and a Scottish delegation travelled to London to warn the king about the growing estrangement.⁴⁶ Napier offered to organize a network of correspondents in Scotland who could inform and advise Charles about local developments, but the king did not act on his proposal.

Within this context, the emergence of a masonic controversy in 1627–28 reveals that the religious quarrels that polarized Scottish Freemasons in the later Jacobean years intensified in the early Carolinian reign. The controversy was provoked by Sir William St. Clair, son of the "fornicating, brawling Catholic laird of Roslin" who had

⁴⁴ Ibid., 38.

⁴⁵ G. Donaldson, *Scotland*, 296–98.

⁴⁶ Maurice Lee, *The Road to Revolution: Scotland Under Charles I, 1625–37* (Urbana and Chicago: Chicago UP, 1985), 36.

earlier served as patron of the masons.⁴⁷ St. Clair *père* had emigrated to Ireland and abandoned his architectural work at Roslin Castle. St. Clair's son, in the meantime, had become a prominent citizen who completed the castle in the early 1620's. By 1627 the younger St. Clair had earned the masons' respect by virtue of his "skill and judgement . . . in our said craft and vocatione, and for reparation of the ruins and manifold corruptions and enormitys done by unskillful persons thereintill."⁴⁸ The masons at Roslin consulted with their brethren in lodges at Dundee, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Stirling, Dunfermline, and St. Andrews, and they decided to petition the king to renew the St. Clair Charter and recognize William St. Clair as hereditary patron of the fraternity.

In 1628 they produced the Second St. Clair Charter with significant claims for the antiquity of this tradition:

Be it known that . . . us, the Deacons, masters and freemen of the masons and hammermen of the Kingdom of Scotland, that . . . as from age to age, it has been observed amongst us and our predecessors, that the Lairds of Roslin have been patrons and protectors of us and our privileges . . . our predecessors have obeyed, revered, and acknowledged them as patrons and protectors, whereof they had letters of protection and other rights granted by his Majesty's most noble progenitors of worthy memory . . .⁴⁹

Unfortunately, after a fire at Roslin Castle destroyed the old charters, the masons' craft deteriorated without the hereditary leadership of the Lairds of Roslin.

The masons reminded Charles that his father and William Schaw had ratified the First St. Clair Charter and that St. Clair *père* had fulfilled his role as patron admirably. However, after he left for Ireland, too many "corruptions and imperfections" arose. Now, they sought official recognition of St. Clair *filz* as hereditary patron, who would call meetings, discipline wrongdoers, raise standards, and revive morale. Masons from Edinburgh and other towns met with St. Clair at Roslin on 1 May 1628, and it was probably at this time that they sent the charter to the king in London. However, Charles's Master of Works, James Murray, seemed threatened by St. Clair's assertion of broad jurisdiction. In the same month, Murray asked for and

⁴⁷ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 56–61.

⁴⁸ R. Hay, *Genealogies*, 161.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 159–60. I have modernized the spelling.

received a royal confirmation of his power over all those in the building trades working on royal edifices.⁵⁰ Charles read and initially approved the Second St. Clair Charter, but he also recognized Murray's concerns.

Probably to palliate Murray and the royalist craftsmen, Charles encouraged his master mason Wallace to undertake an ambitious scheme to construct the "fantastic Heriot's Hospital" in Edinburgh, which would consist of an elaborately detailed massive block about a courtyard with four square towers and would eventually become "the largest and most perfect early seventeenth-structure in Scotland."⁵¹ The Scottish benefactor George Heriot, who had become wealthy from his role as jeweller to James I and Queen Anne, bequeathed his fortune to the city of Edinburgh in 1624. The hospital was actually a school for the education of "poor Orphans and Fatherless children of decayed Burgesses and Freemen."⁵² Heriot's Scottish executor, Sir Walter Balanqual (current dean of Rochester), sent a design from London, and Bishop Laud took a great interest in the aim and progress of the work.⁵³

Balanqual's plan drew on a Mediterranean villa designed by Serlio, and in 1627 the governors specified that the master mason must "conforme to ye paterne and prescript maid be ye said Deane of Rochester." However, after laying the foundation stone in 1628, Wallace and his masons greatly enhanced the design until it became a palatial showpiece of chivalric royalist culture. In the profusion of buckle quoins and richly embroidered stonework, the masons expressed in architecture the themes of knightly pageantry currently celebrated in Inigo Jones's masques. Their pride in their work is still evident in the large number of masons' marks carved into the elaborate stonework. As construction continued over the next years, Heriot's Hospital functioned as visible testimony to the ambition, expertise, and loyalty of a large number of Scottish masons.

Despite this seeming conciliation of masonic factions in Scotland, the king's attention to Scottish issues was too soon distracted by disastrous events in London and abroad. The Puritans in Parliament

⁵⁰ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 60–62.

⁵¹ A. MacKechnie, "Evidence," 110, 113.

⁵² D. Howard, *Scottish Architecture*, 135–38.

⁵³ W. Laud, *Works*, VI, part 1, p. 318.

increasingly blamed Buckingham for English military failures against Spain and France, and they decreased their already paltry funding for royal projects. In March 1628 a frustrated and angry king dissolved Parliament and determined to maintain a personal rule over Great Britain. In June the Commons presented a remonstrance to the king in which they claimed that a vast secret conspiracy to extirpate Protestantism was currently underway in Britain, encouraged by Buckingham's family. Frightened and inspired by the paranoid sensationalism of the remonstrance, a disgruntled soldier named John Felton assassinated Buckingham on 23 August. Lockyer observes that Felton was "the prototype of the puritan 'fanatics' who were to appear in extraordinary numbers when the great rebellion broke out in the 1640's."⁵⁴

The assassination of Buckingham especially alarmed members of the Order or Family of the The Fancy, which grew out of the earlier fraternities of Bugles and Titere-tu. The Fancy was founded by James Smith (clergyman and poet), and John Mennes (naval officer and poet), who both served in Buckingham's naval expeditions. Mennes was one of the first to interrogate the assassin Felton, and he was horrified at his answer: "'twas not he, but the hand of Heaven that gave the stroke; and tho' his whole body had been cover'd with Armour of Proof, he could not have avoided it." Mennes's concern about the dangers of religious fanaticism may have influenced the "Famelist" elements in the Fancy which attracted members with a variety of religious beliefs. Raylor suggests that various actors in the King's Players and younger members of the court were attracted to the order.⁵⁵

One probable participant was William Murray, nephew of Charles I's Scottish tutor Sir Thomas Murray. As the youthful companion and fellow student of Prince Charles, William continued to serve as a trusted royal servant. Appointed Gentleman of the Bedchamber in 1626, he provided a valuable liaison between Charles and the nobles and clergy in Scotland.⁵⁶ Later, when civil war broke out, knights of the Fancy were recruited to the king's military service and proved staunch royalists. On one level, the order provided an outlet for

⁵⁴ R. Lockyer, *Buckingham*, 441–42, 458–59.

⁵⁵ T. Raylor, *Cavaliers*, 36, 66.

⁵⁶ "William Murray," *DNB*.

boisterous drinking and bawdy verse-making—like many similar fraternities of apprentices in Europe. However, it also provided a more serious bonding, for the Family of the Fancy constituted a kind of surrogate family in which “the privileges of birth and the unjust system of primogeniture were exchanged for a system of intellectual meritocracy in which one stood or fell on one’s own abilities.”⁵⁷

The notion of an egalitarian meritocracy within a secret fraternity would be a hallmark of later Freemasonry, and it is relevant that in 1628 there is evidence of the organization of a fraternity of Scottish loyalists at the court of Charles I. On 22 October the Scottish courtier Sir David Cunningham wrote to his namesake David Cunningham of Robertland:

... the noble fraternitie had our solemne meeting in London, being now ... just forty in number. Wee have taken in sundrie of the beddchamber and others of qualitie and worth, and have forever hereafter excluded and discharged to admit of any but his majesties servants ... Also wee have established laudable and good orders to be observed, under the forfeiture of certain penalties, whereby wee shall avoyde all manner of excesse, royat and disorder ... These enclosed badges of the noble brothered is to be worne ... about your hatband, untill our next meeting which is to be every six monthes.⁵⁸

That there was a quasi-Masonic element in the fraternity is suggested by the membership of David Cunningham of Robertland, whose father and uncle held the office of Master of Works under James VI and I. The uncle, Sir Alexander Cunningham, had a son who joined the lodge at Kilwinning in 1675. That “sundrie of the beddchamber” had been initiated implies that William Murray was included—suggesting a possible overlap with the Family of the Fancy. At this time, Murray also undertook an ambitious architectural project at Ham House (a gift from the king), where he commissioned the carving of two twisted columns—a Solomonic reference to Jachin and Boaz.⁵⁹ According to a murky tradition preserved in the eighteenth-century Clermont rite of *Écossais* Masonry, a special Templar order within the fraternity was established in 1628, with Jacob Gremy serving as Prior until 1640, when David Ramsay became “Vicarius

⁵⁷ T. Raylor, *Cavaliers*, 103.

⁵⁸ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 186–87.

⁵⁹ Doreen Cripps, *Elizabeth of the Sealed Knot: A Biography of Elizabeth Murray, Countess of Dysart* (Kineton: Roundwood, 1975), 2–4, plate 1.

Magistraturae.”⁶⁰ Nothing more is known about Gremy, but Ramsay was a close friend of Sir David Cunningham, who would later be cited as a witness to Ramsay’s financial probity in his mechanical and chemical dealings with Charles I.⁶¹

In the meantime in Scotland, there was a continuing effort to resolve problems within Freemasonry. In 1629 Charles named Sir William Alexander as Secretary of State for Scotland, and he appointed his second son Anthony Alexander as joint Surveyor and Master of Works with James Murray. Anthony had “acquired skill in architectorie,” which he studied on the Continent, and it was expected that he should ultimately succeed the older Murray in the office.⁶² In the same year, John Mylne petitioned the king to allow the masons and wrights of Dundee to elect a deacon and thus form an incorporation. The Dundee masons had encountered local opposition and had lost their appeal to the Scottish Privy Council; thus, their petition to the king seems an attempt to surmount local hostilities.⁶³ Charles was unable or unwilling to help them, but he would later appoint Mylne as king’s master mason (in 1631).

While these obscure controversies and negotiations continued, Charles and his architects in London initiated an ambitious new phase of royalist architecture. Now that Buckingham was dead, Charles recognized the fruitlessness of the military campaign against Spain and began secret peace overtures. He also recognized the wisdom of his father’s pacific policies and determined to honor James’s Solomonic ideals. In May 1629 the king sent the architect Gerbier and the military officer Mennes on a clandestine mission to Peter Paul Rubens, who was then acting as a secret agent between Charles and the Hapsburgs. In June Gerbier and Mennes accompanied Rubens to London, where the artist-diplomat helped devise a formula for peace with Spain. Charles and Inigo Jones also confided to Rubens their plans to complete Whitehall Palace, according to the designs worked out with James in the early 1620’s.⁶⁴

A humanist Catholic, Rubens was well versed in Jewish traditions about Solomon. He had recently completed a painting for Marie de

⁶⁰ W. Zimmerman, *Von den alten*, 375.

⁶¹ See William Ramsay, *Astrologia Restaurata* (London, 1653), 28–29.

⁶² D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 61, 194.

⁶³ D. Stevenson, *First Freemasons*, 94–95.

⁶⁴ P. Palme, *Triumph*, 78–80.

Medici, a protector of Jews and student of Cabalistic magic, which included the twisted columns of Jachin and Boaz. With Charles and his architects, Rubens agreed to paint a series of ceiling canvases to illustrate the Solomonic achievements of King James.⁶⁵ He may also have communicated news about the Rosicrucians in Holland, for he had read their tracts and followed their activities in the 1620's.⁶⁶ It was no coincidence that Mennes, who spent much time with Rubens, immersed himself in the study of alchemy and Hermetic medicine in 1629.⁶⁷ The fact that Rubens believed the Rosicrucians were a real society may have stimulated Robert Fludd to enter the fray once again.

In 1629 Fludd published *Sophie cum Moria Certamen*, a reply to an attack by Marin Mersenne, the French mechanist who had earlier ridiculed the Rosicrucians and who pursued a vendetta against Fludd. Though Fludd made only one reference to the "Fratribus R.C.," he collaborated with Joachim Frizius, whose Rosicrucian apologia *Summum Bonum* was bound with Fludd's work by the printers at Frankfurt. Frizius's work takes "a highly spiritual, mystical approach to the subjects of Magic, Cabala, Alchemy, and the Fraternity of the Rosy Cross."⁶⁸ At the end of the *Summum Bonum*, Frizius added a letter written by the fraternity to a German candidate who had just completed one year in the order. The letter was obtained by a Polish friend in Dantzig and attempted to prove the existence of the fraternity and their high Christian ideals.

Because the *Summum Bonum* so closely paralleled Fludd's style, many assumed that he was the author. However, in 1633 Fludd responded that the work was written by a Scot, an intimate friend, and that he translated part of it from Scots English into Latin. Heisler suggests that the Scot was Dr. William Maxwell, a mysterious figure who later described his friendship with Fludd.⁶⁹ Maxwell may be the king's physician of the same name who was admitted to a Masonic

⁶⁵ R. Strong, *Britannia Triumphans*, 16.

⁶⁶ Peter Paul Rubens, *The Letters of Peter Paul Rubens*, trans. and ed. Ruth S. Magurn (1955; rpt. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1971), 93, 147.

⁶⁷ T. Raylor, *Cavaliers*, 38.

⁶⁸ W. Huffman, *Fludd*, 157-58.

⁶⁹ R. Heisler, "Robert Fludd," 141; William Maxwell, M.D. Scoto-Britano, *De Medicina Magnetica*, ed. Georgio Franco (Frankfurt: J.B. Zubrardt, 1679), 134. On Dr. Maxwell, see J. Godwin, *Fludd*, 9.

lodge in Edinburgh in 1647 (accompanied by Robert Moray, a student of Rosicrucianism).⁷⁰ Unfortunately, little is known about William Maxwell, and there are several other Scottish candidates for the author of *Summum Bonum*, who participated in Fludd's milieu in London in the 1620's.

The first is Robert Napier, who had Rosicrucian contacts on the Continent and who occasionally visited London. Robert produced a treatise, "The Revelation of the Golden Fleece, or Philosophical Analysis whereby the marrow of the true Hermetic Intention is made manifest to such of my posterity as fear God." This singular manuscript contained quotations from the Rosicrucian Daniel Müller, as well as "extracts from the cabalistic works of the most noted adepts."⁷¹ Robert Napier left the work in his charter chest with an admonition to his son to reveal its secrets only to the "few in all ages, whoes harts are upright towards God, and not given to worldly ambitione or covetousnes, but secretly to do gud and help the poor and indigent in this world."

A second contender is David Ramsay, who protected Ziegler and shared Fludd's interest in steel-making and alchemy.⁷² Like Frizius, Ramsay wrote a Rosicrucian-style treatise entitled "*Liber Philosophicus, de Diviniis Mysteriis, de Deo, Hominibus, Anima, Meteroris.*"⁷³ The manuscript demonstrated Ramsay's expertise in Cabalistic mathematics and angel magic, as well as his interest in "omnia architectonice figura." His son William Ramsay, who shared his father's occult studies, would later include "all the Brethren of the Rosy Cross" among "the greatest physicians" who argue the necessity of studying chemistry, metals, and stones.⁷⁴

Two additional possibilities are George Erskine and Robert Kerr, who collaborated in copying Rosicrucian treatises. That Frizius quoted from "Arbatel" is pertinent, for in 1602 Erskine translated into Scots English a long magical treatise entitled "Arbatel, The Magick of the Auncient Philosophers, the Cheiff Study of Wisdom."⁷⁵ Like Frizius, Erskine corresponded with alchemists in Germany and Poland. His

⁷⁰ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 198.

⁷¹ J. Small, "Sketches," 418–26.

⁷² "David Ramsay," *DNB*.

⁷³ British Library: Sloane MS. 1046.

⁷⁴ W.R. [William Ramesey], *De Venenis: or, a Discourse of Poysons* (London: Samuel Speed, 1663), written 26 October 1660, dedicated to Charles II.

⁷⁵ Erskine MS. AB 4/21. ff. 1–16.

friend Kerr had recently (January 1629) been sent by Charles I to The Hague with a message of condolence to the Winter King and Queen, whose son Frederick Henry had tragically drowned.⁷⁶ This loss was greatly lamented by Rosicrucian sympathizers. When Kerr returned, he began plans for architectural projects on his Scottish properties, and he continued to collect works by Fludd.

Ramsay, Erskine, and Kerr were almost certainly Freemasons, and their mutual interest in Rosicrucianism and Masonry may explain the engraving on the title-page of Frizius's *Summum Bonum*, which features a large rose growing on a cross stem, with bees coming from a row of hives.⁷⁷ A Latin motto asserts that "The rose gives the bees honey." Bees had been publicly associated with royalist Freemasonry since 1608, when Topsell praised their architectural and masonic skills and argued that they served as "examples to men of politicall prudence and fidelity."⁷⁸ Drawing on seventeenth-century traditions of Scotch-Irish Masonry, Jonathan Swift revealed that a lodge is called a hive, and "when a Dissention happens in a Lodge, the going off and forming another Lodge is . . . call'd SWARMING."⁷⁹ Thus, Frizius's emblem may reflect the merging of Rosicrucianism (persecuted in Europe) into Freemasonry (encouraged in Scotland)—a merger that would soon be proclaimed in *The Muses Threnodie*, composed circa 1631. That Frizius also wrote on the symbolism of the Temple and the "Architecti typo" reinforces this interpretation.⁸⁰

In 1630 there is suggestive evidence of interchange between English and Scottish Freemasons, for Nicholas Stone recorded proudly that he made a monumental tomb for Sir Adam Newton, former Scottish tutor in mathematics to Prince Henry, "for the wich my very noble friend Sir David Cunningham payd me."⁸¹ A student of architecture and neo-Platonic philosophy, Newton had also been a close friend of Robert Kerr.⁸² At this time, Stone served as Warden of the London Masons' Company, where he introduced some Scottish practices. Cunningham, whose family was long active in Masonry,

⁷⁶ R. Kerr, *Correspondence*, I, xvii.

⁷⁷ The engraving is reproduced in J. Godwin, *Fludd*, 10.

⁷⁸ E. Topsell, *History of Serpents*, 70.

⁷⁹ J. Swift, *Works*, V, 328.

⁸⁰ Joachim Frizium, *Summum Bonum quod est veram Magiae, Cabalae, Alchymiae, Fratrum Roseae Crucis verorum verae subjectum* (Frankfurt, 1629), 29, 53, 49.

⁸¹ N. Stone, *Notebook*, 65–66.

⁸² R. Kerr, *Correspondence*, I, ix.

had also joined the quasi-Masonic fraternity that bonded together selected members of Charles's court.⁸³ He and Stone remained intimate friends and architectural collaborators over the next decade.

In that same year, 1630, a small but significant connection between Swedish Rosicrucianism and Scottish Freemasonry emerged, when an expatriate Scottish minister, John Dury, travelled to London from the Baltic port of Elbing and moved in with his maternal uncle, David Ramsay.⁸⁴ Because the Swedish-Scottish link would continue into the eighteenth-century and provide clues to many puzzling Masonic developments, its slender thread will be traced through the complex weave of Stuart affairs over the next decades. Moreover, a re-evaluation of the activities of John Dury and his Elbing-born colleague Samuel Hartlib—promoters of Swedish Rosicrucian and Baltic "Antilian" plans—will provide a new perspective on their relation to Rosicrucian and Masonic developments in Britain.

After Dury's birth in Edinburgh, his father was forced to flee Scotland because of his radical views. John was educated at Leiden and ordained as a Presbyterian minister at Amsterdam. From 1625 to 1630, he served as minister to the English Company of Merchants at Elbing, which became a possession of the Swedish king in 1625. Long troubled by the strife and divisiveness within Protestantism, Dury believed that Gustavus Adolphus could serve as a vehicle for Protestant unification and pansophic enlightenment. From the Swedish and German millenarians at Elbing and Rostock ("a seedbed for secret brotherhoods in the 1620's"), Dury learned about their attempt to establish "Antilia," a secret fraternity that would utilize alchemy and technology to work for Protestant union.⁸⁵ Inspired by Andreae's utopian writings, the Antilians sought out sympathizers in Sweden and throughout the warring cities of Germany.

They were especially hopeful that the Swedish king would lead their cause because of his patronage of Johannes Bureus, his former tutor and a Rosicrucian enthusiast. An erudite and eccentric polymath, Bureus studied the *Sepher Yetzirah* and rare Cabalistic treatises

⁸³ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 186–87.

⁸⁴ George H. Turnbull, *Hartlib, Comenius, and Dury* (London: Hodder, Stoughton, 1947), 132.

⁸⁵ D. Dickson, *Tessera*, 120–26; J. Andreae, *Christianopolis*, 292–96.

in order to develop a millenarian theosophy of "Gothic Cabala."⁸⁶ He responded excitedly to the Rosicrucian manifestos and published his own Rosicrucian tracts, which were distributed to various cities on the Baltic and condemned in 1617 as "the nonsense of the Brothers of the Rosy Cross sent here [Lübeck] from Stockholm."⁸⁷ At Rostock a "Rosenacademie" was established in 1619 to study "the mystery from Stockholm." Among those interested in the movement were several Scots resident in Rostock, including Thomas Reid, who became Latin secretary to James I. It was probably through these Scots that Dury learned about the "Rosenacademie," to which he later referred. News about Swedish Rosicrucianism also filtered back to England, where Robert Burton acquired a copy of Bureus's *FaMa e sCanzla re DUX* (second edition, 1618).

In the late 1620's, as Gustavus Adolphus prepared to march his army onto the Continent, Swedish millenarians contributed propaganda for the Protestant crusade. Bureus, who was increasingly preoccupied with apocalyptic visions and interpretations, merged Paracelsan and Rosicrucian themes into a series of nationalist prophecies, in which the "Lion of the North," the messianic embodiment of *Storgöticism*, would roll back the Papist tide in Europe. Despite opposition from many orthodox Lutherans, Bureus was protected by Gustavus, who appointed him Antiquary-Royal in 1629. Michael Roberts observes that the Swedish Rosicrucian pronouncements supported the war effort in Germany "by producing a state of rapt ecstatic expectation," in which Gustavus Adolphus was "awaited as a divine deliverer; and by giving to his progress in Germany a nimbus of predestined fate."⁸⁸

In 1629 Charles I was drawn closer to the Swedish Rosicrucian movement, when he was persuaded by Scottish and Swedish agents that he should contribute not just financial but military aid to Gustavus's campaign against the Hapsburgs. Charles agreed to the proposal of his Scottish confidante James, Third Marquis of Hamilton, that he levy volunteers for the Swedish army. The Marquis then sent his kinsman Colonel Alexander Hamilton, a military engineer,

⁸⁶ K.U. Nylander, "Semitiska studier i Sverige under flydda tider," *Ny Svensk Tidskrift*, 10 (1889), 194–99.

⁸⁷ S. Akerman, *Rose Cross*, 27–67, 151.

⁸⁸ See Michael Roberts, *Gustavus Adolphus* (London: Longmans, Green 1953), I, 517–27.

to offer their services to Gustavus.⁸⁹ In May 1630 the Swedish king agreed to take the Hamiltons into his service on condition that they bring six thousand troops. One Scottish recruit was George Douglas, step-brother of the Rosicrucian enthusiast Robert Kerr, who then followed Swedish affairs with interest.⁹⁰

When Gustavus arrived in Elbing, he received a petition from Dury, who urged the king to lead the irenic movement toward Protestant unity and peace.⁹¹ Several Scottish military officers, including James Ramsay (cousin of Dury and David Ramsay) and James Spens were then serving Gustavus, and they lent their support to new British-Swedish negotiations. But the Antilians placed their greatest hopes in Sir Patrick Ruthven, a Scottish officer, who had joined the Swedish army in 1606 after his family was proscribed for their participation in the Gowrie Conspiracy.⁹² Ruthven was knighted by Gustavus in 1627, in recognition of his role in installing the Swedish king in the Order of the Garter. He shared Hermetic interests with his kinsman of the same name, Patrick Ruthven, who carried on a secret medical practice in London while maintaining contact with alchemists in Germany and Scotland.⁹³ Dury met General Ruthven at Elbing and believed that his favored position with the Swedish king would attract support for Antilia in Britain.

Thus, when Dury arrived at David Ramsay's residence in July 1630, he brought with him a full awareness of the Rosicrucian influences on Gustavus Adolphus's religious and military plans. The Scottish-Swedish network placed great hopes in Ramsay's influence in Edinburgh as well as London, for Ramsay had recently been made a "Burgess and Gildbrother" of Edinburgh *gratis*, as "one of his majesties privie chamber."⁹⁴ Dury also brought with him a manuscript copy of laws for the proposed Antilian society, which he must

⁸⁹ Alf Åberg, "Scottish Soldiers in the Swedish Armies in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," in Grant Simpson, ed., *Scotland and Scandinavia* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1990), 96; George Sinclair, "Scotsmen Serving the Swede," *SHR*, 9 (1912), 37–51.

⁹⁰ R. Kerr, *Correspondence*, I, xxvii. Douglas remained in the Swedish army until 1635–36, when he died in Pomerania.

⁹¹ Gunnar Westin, *Negotiations About Church Unity, 1628–1634* (Uppsala: A.B. Lundequistka, 1932), 125–26, 187–91.

⁹² "Patrick Ruthven," *DNB*.

⁹³ J. Read, "Sketches," 421–26; Edinburgh University Library: MS.Dc.I.30. Patrick Ruthven's Alchemical MSS.

⁹⁴ Harry Carr, ed., *Minutes of the Lodge of Edinburgh, Mary's Chapel, No. 1 (1598–1738)* (London: Quatuor Coronati Lodge, 1962), 114.

have shown to his uncle.⁹⁵ As a Rosicrucian and Freemason, Ramsay would have been interested in two more manuscripts carried over by Dury—the latter’s own treatises, “De cabala sacra” and “Tractatus de Memoria” (written circa 1628–29).⁹⁶

Dury’s treatises were influenced by the Rosicrucian writings of Johan Mylius and the Lullist treatises of Johan Alsted.⁹⁷ Alsted published Bruno’s writings on Lull and the *Clavis Artis Lullianae* (1609), with the intent of reconciling Lull’s logic with that of Aristotle and Ramus and of defending Lull against attackers.⁹⁸ He subsequently learned of Bacon’s criticism of Lull, and he determined to assimilate Baconianism into a reformed Art of Memory. In 1630 Alsted published his *Encyclopaedia*, which combined the “mechanical combinatorial logic” of Lull, the various mnemonic arts of Bruno, and “an unprecedented systematic treatment of the mechanical arts.”⁹⁹

Dury’s interest in Alsted’s millenarian encyclopedism was shared by Samuel Hartlib, who was now running an experimental school in Chichester. In fact, Hartlib hoped to recruit Alsted to the Antilia in 1630.¹⁰⁰ Hartlib was also intrigued by Andreae’s scientific and utopian writings, and he distributed scribal copies of them to potential Antilians in England. One of Andreae’s treatises had particular relevance to Ramsay’s Masonic interests. In *Collectaneorum Mathematicorum decades XI* (1614), Andreae showed “in full the Vitruvian world of architectural methods” and gave examples of “the Pythagorean abacus, the astrolabium, and the dukal Rotae, a predictive wheel of memory.”¹⁰¹ He emphasized the great cultural value of artisans and craftsmen and addressed the work to practitioners in architecture, mathematics, fortification, navigation, mechanics, and agriculture. When Hartlib informed his correspondents that Dury was living with Ramsay, he stressed the latter’s status as Gentleman of the King’s Bedchamber, and it was expected that Ramsay would arrange for Dury to present the “Antilian” proposals to Charles I.

⁹⁵ D. Dickson, *Tessera*, 122, 251–56.

⁹⁶ G. Turnbull, *Hartlib*, 302–03.

⁹⁷ Howard Hotson, “Philosophical Pedagogy in Reformed Central Europe Between Ramus and Comenius: A Survey of the Continental Background of the ‘Three Foreigners,’” in M. Greengrass, *Hartlib*, 45–49.

⁹⁸ R. Lull, *Selected Works*, 83.

⁹⁹ H. Hotson, “Philosophical Pedagogy,” 46–47.

¹⁰⁰ D. Dickson, *Antilia*, 152.

¹⁰¹ S. Akerman, *Rose Cross*, 216–17.

While Dury and Hartlib labored for the cause of Antilian reform and Protestant union, a bitter attack was launched on Rosicrucianism by Parson Willam Foster, who published *Hoplo-crisma-spongus: or, a Sponge to Wipe Away the Weapon Salve* (1631) to ridicule Robert Fludd. Claiming that Frizius, author of the Rosicrucian *Summum Bonum*, was really Fludd, Foster accused Fludd of excusing the Rosicrucians "from being caco-magicians." He then quoted Mersenne, who had wondered why James I suffered "such a man to live and write in his Kingdome." Fludd recognized that Foster hoped to displace him from Charles I's patronage, and he replied in *Doctor Fludds Answer unto M. Foster, or the Squeesing of Parson Fosters Sponge* (1631). He chastized Foster for bringing serious charges of black magic and noted that the fair-minded Gassendi had chastized Mersenne for similar recklessness, which could result in the persecution and banishment of many worthy thinkers. Fludd then claimed to possess letters of support from Sweden, Poland, Prussia, Germany, Transylvania, France, and Italy, even though he often felt like a prophet without honor in his own country.¹⁰²

In 1631 Fludd also wrote a manuscript, *Clavis Philosophiae et Alchymiae Fluddianae*, which he did not publish until 1633.¹⁰³ He replied to Foster's charge by revealing that Frizius was a Scottish friend. After interpreting the *Fama* and *Confessio* as spiritual allegories of alchemy, he asserted that all true seekers of Hermetic wisdom in all denominations qualify as spiritual Rosicrucians. Then, in an important statement, he noted that "those who were formerly called Brothers of the Rosy Cross are today called the Wise, the name (of Rose Cross) being so odious to contemporaries that it is already buried away from the memory of man."¹⁰⁴ The Wise adhere to the external rites and ceremonies of the established church, wherever they are, but they know that truth is not concealed within outward appearances.¹⁰⁵

In Parson Foster's attack on Fludd, he linked Rosicrucianism with Papist magic. However, his perspective was offset by other Puritans who linked it with the anti-Papist Palatinate cause. Thus, while Charles sought to end the war with Spain, many radical Protestants

¹⁰² See especially, Robert Fludd, *Dr. Fludds Answer unto Mr. Foster* (London: N. Butter, 1631), 24, 41, 70. The tract was entered on 25 March 1631.

¹⁰³ W. Huffman, *Fludd*, 202n.50.

¹⁰⁴ F. Yates, *Rosicrucian*, 102-03.

¹⁰⁵ A.E. Waite, *Brotherhood*, 303.

feared a lessening of his commitment to the Palatinate. Their increasingly bitter attacks on royal policy made the irenic project of Hartlib and Dury vulnerable to royal anger at the Puritans. In August 1630 Hartlib stressed the “great wisdom of prudent secrecy” among their English correspondents.¹⁰⁶ One of these, William Speed, wrote in March 1631 that it might be a good idea to “make a lawfull and beneficial use of the learned and temperate spirited Heretickes; as of the Socinians and some Familists,” who might provide the “holy magic” to animate the British commonwealth.” At this time, at least two Familists held minor positions at Charles’s court, one as royal messenger and another as musician.¹⁰⁷

In January 1631, when Dury made contact with Laud, now bishop of London, he seemed to couch his proposals in Familist terms, for there were many similarities between Familism and Arminianism (the form of Anglicanism advocated by Laud, with its de-emphasis on minor doctrinal differences within the externally unified national church). Two years later, Laud would privately commission a fine manuscript copy, with gilt centerpiece, of Hendrik Niklaes’s *Second Exhortation to His Children and to the Family of Love*.¹⁰⁸ Dury’s proposals were presented to the king, and Charles appointed Laud to oversee Dury’s negotiations in Germany.¹⁰⁹ However, Dury received no official commission, and he was ordered to maintain secrecy and “not suffer any debates to be taken up or fomented about matters of Ceremony in public worship.” Just before leaving England for Germany in July, Dury appealed to Laud to make the Church of England “the cornerstone of the building” of the universal Protestant church—an effort in which Laud would be “the repairer of the breaches of many generations.”

Dury was wise to appeal to Laud in architectural terms, for the bishop was then undertaking an ambitious program of repairing and building churches and colleges. At Oxford Laud directed the designing and extension of St. John’s College, where he participated in a

¹⁰⁶ G. Turnbull, *Hartlib*, 133–38.

¹⁰⁷ C. Marsh, *Family of Love*, 244.

¹⁰⁸ H.O. Coxe, *Bodleian Library Quarto Catalogues, II: Laudian Manuscripts* (Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1973), 60.

¹⁰⁹ G. Westin, *Negotiations*, 101–106.

masonic ceremony and laid the first stone of the inner quadrangle.¹¹⁰ Laud earned the respect of the masons when he personally compensated them for losses they incurred on the project. Richard Maude, a self-described "Freemason," left a rare document testifying to Laud's attention and generosity to his fellow craftsmen.¹¹¹ In the face of Puritan iconoclasts, Laud confidently proclaimed the "Beauty of Holiness."

With the birth of Prince Charles on 29 May 1630 and the signing of a peace treaty with Spain on 5 November, the king and queen dedicated themselves to a renewal of the Solomonic policies of King James. Charles had knighted Rubens in March and sent him back to Antwerp to work on the great ceiling paintings for the Banqueting House. Now he collaborated with Laud and Jones on schemes for beautifying London and restoring decayed edifices. A new building commission was established, and king and bishop took a direct hand in the reconstruction of St. Paul's, according to the designs that Jones developed for James. Hart argues that Jones's Dee-influenced interpretation of Stonehenge influenced his plans for resurfacing St. Paul's, which was to be "restored as the centre of the magic Albion."¹¹²

At the same time, Charles directed the Scottish Privy Council to undertake repairs to castles and churches in anticipation of his planned visit to the northern kingdom. He also dealt with the continuing controversy provoked by the Second St. Clair Charter. On 4 March 1631 the king wrote to the Council that he would ratify the charter as long as there were no valid complaints against it.¹¹³ However, complaints emerged immediately when James Murray and Anthony Alexander, the king's co-Surveyors and Masters of Works, demanded to see documentary proof for the hereditary claims of the St. Clairs. On 22 March the Council recorded the reception of "ane missive frome his Majestie in favour of the Laird of Rosline for expediting of a gift unto him makand and constituand him judge and overseair of the trade of maissonis hammermen."¹¹⁴ The Council agreed with

¹¹⁰ John P. Lawson, *The Life and Times of William Laud* (London: C.J.C. and F. Rivington, 1929), I, 556–59.

¹¹¹ W.J. Williams, "A Selection of Wills Made by Testators Described as Freemasons dated between 1605 and 1675," *AQC*, 52 (1941), 164.

¹¹² V. Hart, *Art and Magic*, 134–35.

¹¹³ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 62.

¹¹⁴ *Reg. Privy. Council. Scot.*, 2nd s., IV, 177.

Murray and Alexander that St. Clair must “produce the patentis maid to him of the said office,” and the ratification was thus delayed.

That Charles did not comprehend the religious divisions within Masonry in Scotland reflected his general ignorance about political and spiritual conditions across the border. For Scottish supporters of the king, it was hoped that his expected visit would bridge the widening gulf between Edinburgh and London. The Privy Council commissioned John Stewart, First Earl of Traquair, and George Erskine of Innerteil to oversee the repair of roads and bridges. As noted earlier, Erskine was deeply immersed in Rosicrucian studies and Traquair “possessed the Mason word.”¹¹⁵ The king also appointed John Mylne, son of the mason who built the great bridge at Perth, as royal master mason in Scotland. From this cluster of masonic associations emerged the first explicit identification of Scottish Freemasonry with Rosicrucianism.

Anticipation of Charles I’s visit to Perth inspired Henry Adamson to write *The Muses Threnodie* (MS. circa 1630–31). He hoped that Charles shared the fervent home-longing that his father expressed in 1617, for that was a patriotic inheritance of the Scots. Adamson then praised the “active prudence” and pacific policy of King James, who passed on his wisdom to good King Charles, “the Lord’s anointed.” He was aware of both kings’ determination to rebuild Whitehall Palace, which he compared to that of the masons who built the great bridges at Perth.¹¹⁶ He moved on to the architectural concerns of sons of Caledonia, for “all men who have heard thy fame” admire the stone monuments to her heroic past. However, Adamson also expressed the deep ambivalence of Scottish Freemasons about the destruction of the great ecclesiastical edifices of pre-Reformation Scotland.

Recounting his antiquarian jaunts with his friends Gall and Ruthven, he described in detail the mathematical expertise of the Gothic and Renaissance masons and lamented the ruins that were their only surviving testament. Remembering the great medieval abbeys in many Scottish communities, the poet affirmed that “these works did frame/ For merit and for honour of their name.” He recognized the fervent piety of the builders, even though they were Catholics: “Such

¹¹⁵ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 127.

¹¹⁶ H. Adamson, *Muses Threnodie*, 74.

zeal had they, though blind; ah, now a days,/Much knowledge is profest, but zeale decayes." As noted earlier, he defended the religious motives of the Reformist rebels at Perth, who under Knox's inspiration destroyed the great Charterhouse, but he also lamented the loss of its wondrous architecture. Within the context of his fervidly patriotic and lengthy survey of architectural history, Adamson's appeal to Charles I to rebuild the bridge at Perth also expressed his hope for religious and masonic reconciliation.

Adamson recalled an earlier visit to the Tay bridge, soon after its completion by the master mason John Mylne *père*:

Oh happy sight indeed was it that day;
A bridge so stately with eleven arches,
Joining the south and north, and common march is
Unto them both, a bridge of squared stone . . .
. . . So fair, so high, a bridge for many ages
Most famous; but, alas! now through the rages
Of furious swelling waters thrown in deep,
My heart for sorrow sobs, myne eyes do weep . . .¹¹⁷

His friend Gall comforted him by reminding him that although bridges have often been destroyed in Scotland, they are always rebuilt, for they represent the inherited resilience and independence of the nation: "But now all lost, needs Archimedes' skill,-/Oh! if it were supplied by Master Mylne!" The poet was probably aware of the petition by Mylne *fils* to the king and of his appointment as royal master mason.

Adamson confidently issued an appeal to Charles, that he must have planned to deliver when the king arrived in Perth:

Even that great fall the fourteenth of October,
Six hundred twenty one, repair'd may be:
And I do wish, the same that I might see:
For Britain's monarch will it sure repair,
Courage, therefore, Monsier, do not despair!
Is't credible to be believed or told,
That these our Kings who did possess of old
Scotland alone, should such a work erect,
And Britain's mighty Monarch it neglect?
Absurd it is to think, much more to speak it;

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 30.

Therefore, good Monsier, yee do far mistake it,
 For never yet a King was more inclin'd,
 To do great works . . .¹¹⁸

The poet then uttered his remarkable Rosicrucian-Masonic prophecy:

Therefore I courage take, and hope to see
 A bridge yet built, although I aged be;
 More stately, firm, more sumptuous and fair,
 Than any former age could yet compare.
 Thus *Gall* assured me it would be so,
 And my good *Genius* truly doth it know:
 For what we do presage is not in grosse,
 For we be brethren of the *Rosie Crosse*,
 We have the *Mason word*, and second sight,
 Things for to come we can foretell aright,
 And shall we show what misterie we mean,
 In fair acrosticks *Carolus Rex* is seen,
 Describ'd upon that bridge in perfect gold,
 By skilfull art this cleerlie we behold,
 With all the scutcheon of great *Britaines* King,
 Which unto *Perth* most joyfull news shall bring.
 Loath would we be this misterie to unfold,
 But for King *Charles* his honour we are bold.

Heisler points out that one possible acrostic of *Carolus Rex* is *Roseal Crux*, with the "L" taken as an imperfect "E."¹¹⁹

Did Adamson consider Charles to be a Rosicrucian as well as Masonic king? Did he have inside information from George Erskine, the Rosicrucian enthusiast, who was assigned to raise funds for the bridge at Perth? Erskine was deeply involved in Charles's architectural plans for Scotland, and he was a member of the Privy Council when the king, in March 1632, ordered them to build a new Parliament House in Edinburgh before the royal visit. The provost and baillies of the city agreed to the plan and promised to present a "platt and modell of the hous" and to consult the Council "tuicheing the fabrick and maner of contryvance of the same."¹²⁰ Murray designed and directed the project, for which Alexander Mylne (son of the new master mason) carved life-size, stone figures of Justice and Mercy. It

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 31–32.

¹¹⁹ R. Heisler, "Rosicrucianism," 53.

¹²⁰ *Reg. Privy. Council. Scot.*, 2nd s., IV, 449.

was perhaps relevant that in the Cabala Justice and Mercy were represented by the Left and Right Pillars.¹²¹

One Scottish courtier who took seriously the king's architectural agenda was Erskine's Rosicrucian collaborator Robert Kerr, who planned to accompany the king to Scotland. He had long shared the Stuarts' Solomonic sense of architecture, which was reinforced by the publication of John Weemes's *An Explanation of the Ceremoniall Laws of Moses* (1632), dedicated to Kerr. A Scottish royalist and erudite Hebraist, Weemes praised Kerr for his generous support of studies in Jewish history and architecture, and he devoted long sections to the design and construction of the Tabernacle and Temple of Jerusalem.¹²² Weemes was especially indebted to Drusius and Scaliger for his ideas about the builders, but he also drew on Josephus, Ibn Ezra, Kimchi, and the Talmud. In *The Christian Synagogue*, which included significant Jewish-masonic information, Weemes cited Dionysius the Areopagite and Jewish scholars to justify the royalist hierarchy from king to artisan, quoted Duns Scotus on Israelite temples and synagogues, discussed Jewish techniques of vision, and compared homophilic friendship to heterosexual marriage.¹²³ Thus, the friendship of Weemes and Kerr was significant for Rosicrucian and Masonic developments in Scotland.

On 20 December 1632 Kerr wrote a long letter to his son William, now Third Earl of Lothian, with detailed instructions on how to reconstruct Ancram House, near Edinburgh. Their correspondence was carried by Traquair, who shared their masonic interests. Well-read and practiced in architecture, Kerr used operative masonic terms while he "chalked" out the "new frame" and advised on stone-fitting, mortar, and lime.¹²⁴ Kerr expected his son to work closely with his masons and, from later evidence, it seems certain that Lothian became a Freemason.¹²⁵ While suggesting various fashionable innovations from England and France, Kerr insisted that his

¹²¹ Knorr von Rosenroth, *The Kabbalah Unveiled*, trans. and ed. S.L. Magregor Mathers (1887; rpt. New York: Samuel Weiser, 1978), 28, pl. iii.

¹²² John Weemes, *The Workes of Mr. John Weemes* (London: T. Cotes, 1633), III, 27–30, 164.

¹²³ John Weemes, *The Christian Synagogue*, 4th rev. ed. (London: John Bellamy, 1633), A2, 22–23, 103–12.

¹²⁴ R. Kerr, *Correspondence*, I, 62–76. His library included many volumes on architectural theory, history, and practical techniques, including operative masonry.

¹²⁵ See Chapters Eight and Nine.

son "not take away the battlement, as some gave me counsel to do," for that is "the grace of the house, and makes it looke like a castle, and hence so nobleste, as the other would make it look lyke a peeple [fortified tower]."

Kerr's continued devotion to castellated architecture was a patriotic expression of "national style."¹²⁶ Like the Stuart monarchs, he viewed architecture as an embodiment of political policy. His son must "make Ancrame and that which belonged to it the pryme plac and example to the rest, as it is the cheeff, and yeelds so many different occasions of ornament and polishing, which our people call pollicy." However, Kerr sensed that increasing religious polarization in Scotland boded ill for ambitious, long-range architectural projects. He urged his son to keep the walls "as they are, strong in the out syde, because the world may change agayne." He should also build a secret cabinet for books and papers, in order to keep them "from the eyes and fingers of others." The Kerrs were so successful that their concealed papers were not discovered until the late nineteenth-century.

While the Freemasons at Perth and Ancram awaited in eager anticipation the king's projected visit, Inigo Jones's craftsmen and masque-makers in London celebrated the impending journey with similar mystical-masonic symbolism. Hart observes that from 1631 onwards, Jones's buildings were influenced by Italian "Pythagorean Palaces" and "Hermetic Jesuit" architecture exemplified by the Escorial.¹²⁷ Like their Catholic counterparts, his designs reflected the contemporary interest in Neoplatonism and "Cabala in particular." In the masques, the invisible back-stage mechanics which made the visible front-stage theatrics possible seemed "akin to the very quest of the Cabala." The Cabalistic-Platonic allegories harmonised music, dance, costume, and changeable perspective scenery in the presentation of enchantments and transformations:

... for the illusory effects of these to work on the Court audience, the masque depended on the belief that complex occult correspondences controlled the cosmos... the masque celebrated the monarch's supposed magical powers over nature herself. As such this art-form became not merely a moving visualisation, or artistic representation, of the hidden astrological workings of a talisman, but a form of religious ritual

¹²⁶ D. Howard, *Scottish Architecture*, 51, 219.

¹²⁷ V. Hart, *Art and Magic*, 8.

actually blessing the Court . . . And as the engineer of this illusion, Inigo Jones came to resemble the magus.¹²⁸

These ambitious themes were elaborately expressed on 8 February 1632, when Jones produced the king's masque, *Albion's Triumph*, with script by Aurelian Townshend. Charles was portrayed as heir to the glories of a Roman emperor and as husband of the goddess Albano. Written partially in response to Jonson's recent satire on the pretensions of the architect, the masque represented the final break between poet and architect. One spectator reported that Jonson was "for this time discarded, by reason of the predominant power of his antagonist, Inigo Jones."¹²⁹ The production was notable for the splendor and variety of its architectural settings, and it was clearly a bold statement of the superior importance of architecture in the realm of art and poetry. The audience first saw a Roman atrium, then a forum, then a temple in a grove, then a landscape with views of London and Whitehall palace. Jones's drawing of a rich proscenium corresponded to Townshend's description:

. . . at the foot of the pillasters, on each side, stood two Women, the one young . . . looking upwards, and on her head, a paire of Compasses of gold, the poynts standing towards Heaven: the other more ancient, and of a venerable aspect . . . looking downewards; in the one hand a long ruler, and in the other, a great paire of iron Compasses, one poynt whereof, stood on the ground, and the other touched part of the ruler. Above their heads, were fixt, compertiments of a new composition, and in that over the first, was written *Theorica*, and over the second *Practica*, shewing that by these two, all works of Architecture, and Ingining have their perfection.¹³⁰

A few weeks later, Jones and Townshend produced the queen's masque, *Tempe Restored*, in which allegorical figures of Theory, Practice, Knowledge, and Invention again declared the glory of architecture.¹³¹ As Jones affirmed that allegory, symbol, and myth are the substance of royalist masques, the spectator and participant found that "the presence of mystic and impenetrable truths afforded considerable pleasure."¹³² The preoccupation of the court with architectural themes

¹²⁸ Ibid., 17.

¹²⁹ J. Gotch, *Inigo Jones*, 149–50.

¹³⁰ Aurelian Townshend, *Aurelian Townshend's Poems and Masks*, ed. E.K. Chambers (Oxford: Clarendon, 1912), 99.

¹³¹ D. Gordon, "Poet and Architect," 165.

¹³² S. Orgel and R. Strong, *Inigo Jones*, I, 9.

was publicly revealed on 24 September, when Charles accompanied Henrietta Maria to Somerset House, where she participated in a masonic ceremony. According to a Capuchin observer, mass was sung and then the queen, "laying hold of a trowel, the handle of which was covered with fine fringed velvet, respectfull presented to her by the intendant of her buildings, and taking mortar from a large glittering basin of silver gilt . . . threw it three times upon the stone."¹³³ Though the records of the London Masons' Company do not survive for this period, the "accepted" Masons almost certainly attended the ceremony.

The king's masonic interests were further expressed in his support for sundial makers, who created increasingly elaborate dials in the royal gardens and courtyards.¹³⁴ As Stevenson notes, sun-dials were a special production of Scottish Freemasons, and they involved skillful cutting of stone as well as elaborate mathematical, geometrical, astronomical, astrological, and Hermetic designs.¹³⁵ The Scots believed that dialling was an originally Jewish art, and Weemes included the diagram of a Hebrew ("Ahaz") dial in *The Christian Synagogue*.¹³⁶ In Edinburgh Alexander Mylne produced a richly complex dial with Stuart emblems for the courtyard at Holyrood. In London the Scottish mathematician John Marr, who had earlier worked on dials with Nicholas Stone, presented Charles with a treatise on "The Description and Use of such lines and circles as are drawn uppon ye Stone-Dialls in . . . Hampton Courte" (1632).¹³⁷ Marr also constructed mathematical instruments and compasses and gave them to the king.

Happy in his marriage and growing family (Mary born in 1631, James in 1633) and immersed in his Solomonic revival, Charles paid renewed attention to Continental affairs but still hoped for peaceful resolutions. He continued to seek financial support for his dethroned sister Elizabeth and for exiles from Bohemia. Though he had allowed the Marquis of Hamilton to raise troops in Scotland, his failure to make a larger commitment to the Palatinate cause produced distrust in Gustavus Adolphus, who also belittled the military capacity of

¹³³ H. Colvin, *History*, IV, 265.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, IV, 122, 205, 251, 354.

¹³⁵ D. Stephenson, *Origins*, 106, 113–14.

¹³⁶ J. Weemes, *Christian Synagogue*, 166.

¹³⁷ M. Feingold, *Mathematicians' Apprenticeship*, 203.

Hamilton and the poverty-stricken impressments brought from Britain. However, Gustavus was willing to listen to Dury's irenic proposals, which he believed had the blessings of the British king.

It is unknown whether Dury also presented to Charles and Gustavus the Rosicrucian-style program for improvement of the arts and sciences that he had developed while staying with Ramsay in London. In a document prepared for his Continental mission, Dury stated that the "Reformators" in Germany had presented certain proposals that "are thought to excell former ages and other societies":

1. Some Extraordinary meanes to perfeit ye knowledge & unvaile the mysteryes of the Propheticall Scriptures.
2. Meanes to perfeit the knowledge of the Orientall tongues, and to gaine abilities fitt to deale with the Jewes, whose calling is supposed to bee neare at hand.
3. Arts and Sciences Philosophicall, Chymicall & Mechanicall: wherby not only the Secrets of Disciplines are harmonically and compendiously delivered, but also the Secrets of Nature are thought to be unfolded, so y:t Gods wonderfull power, wisdom and goodness is to be seene more apparently in bodily things then ever heretofore.
4. A Magicall Language wherby secrets may be delivered and preserved to such as are made acquaint with it traditionally.
5. The frame of a Society and Corporation amongst themselves to make a perfect corporation of the joind parts and uses of all sorts of persons skilled in all sorts of arts and industries Rationall and Mechanicall.¹³⁸

While Dury was influenced by Andreae and the Antilians in this scheme, he may also have included Masonic elements learned from his uncle Ramsay. In a letter to Hartlib, Dury revealed that Ramsay had sent a sympathetic French friend to accompany him on the mission to the Swedish king.¹³⁹

By autumn 1632 Dury had solicited support from more Scots in Swedish service, and the Baltic Antilians now expected great things

¹³⁸ G. Westin, *Negotiations*, 116–17.

¹³⁹ Hartlib Papers, 60/5/1A (Dury to Hartlib, ca. 1632). The royalist physician, Dr. Mayerne, an alchemical colleague of Ramsay, sent a second Frenchman to accompany Dury.

from Sir Patrick Ruthven.¹⁴⁰ However, they were also concerned that Ruthven's famous capacity for alcohol—which Gustavus Adolphus valued highly—was detrimental to their cause. The Swedish king frequently placed Ruthven in drinking bouts, in which he would outlast his competitors while extracting important information from them. Apparently, the proposals for Antilia were presented to Ruthven while he was *in vinis*, which led a worried Johann Fridwall to write Hartlib that he should "propose the business properly to the knight" (i.e., while he was sober) and let Fridwall know at once if he has made up his mind to spend on the matter, in which case several Antilians would visit England in the next spring "at the invitation of the knight, it is understood." The Antilians hoped for seed money from Ruthven in order to finance the labors of an unnamed alchemist who would then subsidize the project. However, Ruthven distrusted the alchemist and delayed his own financial contribution.

Suddenly, the Rosicrucian-fueled Protestant military crusade received a severe blow when the Swedish king was killed at the Battle of Lutzen on 16 November 1632. This was followed thirteen days later by the death of Frederick V, the dethroned Winter King. Because of the messianic aura of invincibility that surrounded Gustavus Adolphus and the large numbers of Scottish soldiers serving with him, there was an outpouring of lamentations in Britain about the shocking death. Aurelian Townshend solicited verses from poets for a memorial volume, but Thomas Carew—now collaborating with Jones on a royal masque—refused to join the glorification of the martial hero. Instead, in his "Answer of an Elegiacall Letter Upon the Death of the King of Sweden," Carew praised the wisdom of Charles I's pacific policy, which found expression in beneficent masques rather than destructive wars.¹⁴¹ As a knight of the Family of Fancy and possibly a secret Catholic, Carew supported Charles's revival of his father's policy of peace and toleration. When he rose in status at the court, he was taken under the wing of Inigo Jones, who asked him to collaborate on a new masque that would further glorify the royal architect of peace and reconciliation.

¹⁴⁰ G. Turnbull, *Hartlib*, 71–72; D. Dickson, *Tessera*, 126–27. The Ruthven family's interest in alchemy reinforces Dury's speculation that the unnamed "English" nobleman was Sir Patrick Ruthven.

¹⁴¹ T. Carew, *Poems*, 74–77.

In the meantime, Jonson reached new levels of vituperation in his quarrel with Jones. Since their co-production of *Chloridia* in 1631, when Jonson angered the architect by putting his own name first in the credits, the poet had vented his spleen in verse satires that circulated in manuscript. In "An Expostulation with Inigo Jones," Jonson scorned Jones's humble background, educational deficiencies, and social pretensions:

Mr Surveyer, you yt first begann
 From thirty pound in pipkins, to ye Man
 you are; from them leapt forth an Architect,
 Able to talk of Euclide, and correct
 Both him & Archimede; damne Architas
 The noblest Ingenyre that ever was!
 Controll Ctesibius: overbearing us
 With mistooke Names out of Vitruvius!¹⁴²

Mocking Jones's lack of Latin, the poet stressed the lightweight intellectual and manipulative political nature of the masques:

... O Showes! Showes! Mighty Showes!
 The Eloquence of Masques! What need of prose
 Or Verse, or Sense t'express Immortall you?
 You are ye Spectacles of State! Tis true
 Court Hieroglyphickes! & all Artes affoord
 In ye mere perspective of an Inch-board!
 You aske noe more then certeyne politique Eyes,
 Eyes yt can pierce into ye Misteryes
 Of many Coulors! read them! & reveale
 Mythology there painted on slit deale!
 Oh, to make Boardes to speake! There is taske
 Painting & Carpentry are ye Soule of Masque.
 Pack with your pedling Poetry to the Stage,
 This is ye money-gett, Mechanick Age!

Obsessed with Vitruvian ideals of "omnipotent Designe," Jones aspired to be the fabler, poet, musical composer, and statesman. Though Jones tried to "shew he had a pate/Moulded or stroakt up to survey a State," he really possessed only "shop-philosophy." To defend the priority of the poet, Jonson even recklessly ridiculed the architectural agenda of the king:

¹⁴² B. Jonson, *Jonson*, VIII, 402-06.

What poesy ere was painted on a wall
 That might compare with thee? what story shall
 Of all ye Worthyes hope t'outlast thy one,
 Soe ye Materialls be of Purbeck stone!
 Lyve long ye feasting Roome. And ere thou burne
 Againe, thy Architect to ashes turne!
 Whom not ten fyres, nor a Parlyament can
 With all Remonstrance make an honest man.

Mocking by implication the Solomonic ambitions of the Banqueting House, Jonson next attacked the "Spanish" presumptions of Jones, who allegedly aspired to an aristocratic title. In "To Inigo Marquess Would be/A Corollary," Jonson contrasted the serious architectural achievements of Giovanni Battista Crescenzo, who designed the Pantheon of the Escorial, to the tawdry achievements of the masques. Philip IV made Crescenzo the Marquis della Torre to reward his brilliance, and Jonson suspected Jones of angling for similar preferment:

But cause thou hearst ye mighty k. of Spaine
 Hath made his Inigo Marquess, wouldst thou fayne
 Our Charles should make thee such? T'will not become
 All kings to doe ye self same deeds with some!
 Besydes, his Man may merit it, and be
 A Noble honest Soule! what's this to thee?
 He may have skill & judgment to designe
 Cittyes & Temples! thou a Cave for Wyne,
 Or Ale He build a pallace! Thou a shopp
 With slyding windowes, & false Lights a top!
 He draw a Forum, with quadriviall Streets!
 Thou paint a Lane, where Thumb ye Pygmy meets! . . .¹⁴³

There were other, even worse satirical attacks, and Jonson soon learned of royal displeasure. His friend James Howell warned him, "I heard you censur'd lately at Court, that have lighted too foul upon Sir *Inigo*, and that write with a *Porcupins* quill dipped in too much Gall." In a second letter, Howell argued that though the "Pen is most predominant" in ruling the world," Jonson must be careful:

I know you have a commanding one [pen], but you must not let it tyrannize in that manner, so give out . . . that your ink was too thick with gall, els it count not have so bespattered and shaken the reputation of a Royall Architect, for reputation, you know is like a faire

¹⁴³ Ibid., VIII, 407.

structure long time a rearing, but quickly ruin'd: If your spirit will not let retract, yet you shall do well to repress any more copies of the Satyre, for to deale plainly with you, you have lost some ground at Court by it, and as I heare from a good hand, the King who hath so great a judgement in Poetry (as in all other things) is not well pleased therewith.¹⁴⁴

Despite these well-intentioned warnings, Jonson went public with his attack by reworking an older play, *A Tale of a Tub*, to include aspersions on Jones. On 14 January 1633 it was acted at court by the Queen's Players, where the royal verdict was "not likte." Jones was so angry at the slanders against him that he asked the Lord Chamberlain to order excisions before it could be performed again. The unrepentant Jonson salvaged what he could from the character "Vitruvius Hoop" and clumsily attached it to "In-and-In Medlay," a lowly joiner.¹⁴⁵ To further diminish the architect's status, the poet mocked Jones as the son of a weaver:

Medlay: Indeed, there is a woundy luck in names, Sirs,
And a maine mysterie, an' a man knew where
To vind it. My god-sires name, Ile tell you,
Was *In-and-In Shittle*, a Weaver he was,
And it did fit his craft: for his Shittle
Went in, and in, still: this way, and then that way,
And he nam'd me, *In-and-In Medlay*: which serves
A Joyners craft, bycause that wee doe lay
Things in and in, in our worke. But, I am truly
Architectonicus professor, rather:
That is (as one would say) an Architect.¹⁴⁶

In these snide identifications of the weaver-joiner's movements with those of male sexual penetrations, Jonson seemed to draw on his copy of *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili*, which merged architectural appreciation with erotic sensation.¹⁴⁷

Jonson then scorned the Vitruvian identification of man with a mathematical-geometrical cosmos, a form of analogy that had been popular in courtly circles since Wotton's description of the "moral architecture" of Buckingham. When the character Scriben describes the lowly Sir Peter Tub as a fine gentleman, the upstart joiner boasts:

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., XI, 152.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., I, 266.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., III, 63.

¹⁴⁷ L. Lefavre, *Alberti's Hypnerotomachia*, 66.

Medlay: He is more:

A Gentleman and a halfe; almost a knight;
Within zixe inches: That's his true measure.

Clench: Zure, you can gage 'hun.

Medlay: To a streake, or lesse:

I know his d'ameters, and circumference:

A Knight is sixe diameters; and a Squire

Is vive, and somewhat more: I know't by compasse,

And skale of man. I have upo' my rule here,

The just proportions of a Knight, or Squire . . .

.....

I have his measures in Rithmetique.

How he should beare un selfe in all the lines

Of place, and office . . .¹⁴⁸

While Jonson scorned the court's enthusiasm for projectors, mechanicians, inventors, and mathematicians, he was most galled by Jones's presumption of Vitruvian control—his determination to pronounce the grand design and implement the details of his projects:

Medlay: I have a little knowledge in designe,

Which I can varie Sir to *Infinilo*.

Tub: *Ad Infinitum* Sir you meane.

Medlay: I doe.

I stand not on my Latine, Ile invent,

but I must be alone then, joyn'd with no man.

This we doe call the Stand-still of our worke.

Tub: Who are those wee, you now joyn'd to your selfe?

Medlay: I meane my selfe still, in the plurall number.¹⁴⁹

When Sir Tub protests that the story is supposed to be about his adventures, Medlay argues that he is the author, which brings a rejoinder from Tub that Medlay is only "The Worke-man Sir! the Artificer!" Jonson's original satire was much more vicious, and he was lucky that his censored version was eventually allowed on the public stage. The revised play was licensed for Queen Henrietta Maria's Men on 7 May 1633, and it was evidently performed while the king was in Scotland. During that journey, the king fulfilled Jonson's worst fears when he knighted James Murray, his Master of Works in Scotland and counterpart of Inigo Jones in England.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁸ B. Jonson, *Jonson*, III, 64–65.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, III, 85.

¹⁵⁰ D. Stephenson, *Origins*, 61.

The quarrel between Jonson and Jones may seem petty, the jealous hostility of two egocentric and autocratic personalities, but it also reflected a growing estrangement between two cultures in Great Britain—the radical Protestant devotion to the word and the conservative Stuart devotion to the image. Smuts notes that this cleavage was rooted in Elizabethan culture, in which there was a distinct contrast between the roles of poetry and the visual arts:

Literary craftsmanship appeared to be a natural extension of the linguistic and rhetorical training normally given to young gentlemen. Consequently, Queen [Elizabeth] herself had no inhibitions about writing verse, and many courtiers could knowledgeably discuss fairly technical literary problems. On the other hand, few members of the royal entourage appear to have studied systematically the techniques of painting, and none, so far as is known, ever tried to paint . . . A nobleman building a house, for example, often suggested features he wanted incorporated and the general layout of the plan, but he rarely attempted to draw up detailed elevations.¹⁵¹

The cultural cleavage received dramatic expression in February 1633, when an angry Laud imposed a huge fine on the recorder of Salisbury, whose iconoclastic fury led him to smash a stained glass window depicting “God the Father as an old man, making the world with a pair of compasses.”¹⁵² That the Stuart kings saw no contradiction between the two cultures, and even prided themselves on their personal practice of literary and mechanical arts, meant that they were puzzled by the quarrel between court poet and court architect. However, when a choice had to be made, the “Mason King” sided with the architect. As Charles prepared to travel to Scotland, where the ancient traditions of Freemasonry had earlier supported the Stuarts’ Solomonic ambitions, he was little prepared for the intensity of the iconoclastic “word worshippers” who saw all image-making as creeping Papism.

Through the repeated postponements of his coronation in Scotland, Charles had created much distrust among his northern subjects about his attitude towards them. Since 1628 the keeper of the Scottish crown had refused to send it to London for a coronation ceremony

¹⁵¹ M Smuts, *Court Culture*, 145.

¹⁵² David Howarth, *Images of Rule: Art and Politics in the English Renaissance, 1485–1649* (London: Macmillan, 1997), 56.

in Westminster Abbey. Urging Charles to come soon to Scotland, the keeper warned that "if he should long defer that duty, they might, perhaps, be inclined to make choice of some other king."¹⁵³ However, Charles dismissed rumors about rival claims to the throne and, when he finally set off for Edinburgh in May 1633, he was blithely unaware of the turbulence that lay ahead. He even expected a sympathetic response to Laud's determination to implement his policy of the "Beauty of Holiness" in Scotland.

The first test of the policy came in northern England. Stopping at York and Durham, king and bishop inspected the great cathedrals, where they were distressed by the "mean tenements" jammed against the church walls (and one shack "within the very cross aisle" at York).¹⁵⁴ Laud ordered that the buildings and unsightly chairs be removed so "that the quire may ever remain in its ancient beauty." Arundel, making his second journey north, reported to London:

... the Church of Durham very well in order, and much the better for the Bishop of London [Laud], the pews being driven out of the temple with the buyers and sellers. The Scottish churches he doubts will not follow the good example.¹⁵⁵

According to Anderson, Arundel now served as Grand Master of the Freemasons, with Inigo Jones as his deputy.¹⁵⁶

Arundel probably heard from Sir William Alexander about the trouble that his son Anthony, James Murray, and their masons faced when they tried to fulfill the architectural agenda of Charles and Laud in preparation for the royal visit. Since January 1633, the Scottish Privy Council had given broad powers to the Masters of Works to survey the state of the royal residences and chapels.¹⁵⁷ Assigned to work with them was the deputy treasurer Traquair, who had long experience of working with builders and craftsmen. It was probably through these projects and his assignment concerning the royal visit that Traquair was initiated into Freemasonry. In February

¹⁵³ Reported by Mead to Stuteville (19 July 1628); in [T. Birch], *Court*, I, 379.

¹⁵⁴ *CSP. Domestic* (1633–34), 72.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 83.

¹⁵⁶ J. Anderson, *Constitutions* (1738), 99–100. Anderson implied that Freemasonry was inherited in the Howard family, when he described Arundel as the "Progenitor of our late Grand Master Norfolk." Thomas Howard, Eighth Duke of Norfolk, was elected English Grand Master in December 1729. Anderson was unaware that he was a crypto-Jacobite.

¹⁵⁷ *Reg. Privy. Council. Scot.*, 2nd s., IV, 23, 25, 53.

Traquair and the Council had to intervene in a quarrel between masons and guild brethren, over the issue of taxation to build a new water supply and public fountains in Aberdeen. The guild brethren accused the craftsmen of violating "the commoun and observed custome in maters of this kynde." At the same meeting, the Council warranted the Masters of Works to set two masons to work on repairs at Edinburgh Castle, with orders to make progress reports to Traquair.

By March the Council was so worried about the state of repairs that they authorized Alexander and Murray to draft masons away from ordinary work in order to complete the extraordinary royal projects. The state of roads and bridges was another concern, and Traquair may have utilized his Masonic networks among the nobility to organize their role in providing craftsmen and laborers in their territories. Fueling the trouble was the preaching of radical Presbyterians, who railed about the Papist agenda behind the repair of chapels and ornamentation of palaces. As we shall see, feelings eventually became so tense that preachers actually attacked the masons in their workplaces. Though Laud had accompanied King James to Scotland, he was not aware of the deteriorating religious situation in the kingdom. In fact, Laud remembered the pride in architecture displayed by the Scots during that visit. But James was a wiser king in dealing with a proud and prickly people, and he was able to maintain his religious and architectural agenda without severely antagonizing the kirk. His son Charles crossed the border with blind faith in the ability of Laud to implant the "Beauty of Holiness" in the dour and decayed churches of the land.

At first, that agenda may have seemed feasible. On 13 June Charles stayed at Seton Palace where George Seton, Third Earl of Winton, lavished hospitality upon the party. Winton combined architectural enthusiasm with expertise in engineering, mining, and salt-panning.¹⁵⁸ Suspected by Presbyterians of being "popishly affected," he was a staunch supporter of the king's building, technological, and ecclesiastical policy. Winton probably showed Charles his model for Winton Castle, now completed in Haddingtonshire, where his masons carved a profusion of emblems of "personal and unionist royal symbolism."¹⁵⁹ The striking and unusual Renaissance design was greatly admired

¹⁵⁸ B. Seton, *House*, 181, 18; "George Seton, Third Earl of Winton," *DNB*.

¹⁵⁹ M. Glendinning, *History*, 40.

in Scotland. Charles enjoyed Winton's company, and he would return to Seton Palace in 1641 (in less happy circumstances).

On 15 June the king entered Edinburgh in a triumphal progress, which had been largely organized by Winton's friend, Drummond of Hawthornden. The Royal Mile was decorated with complex emblems, symbolic arches, and artificial mountains—in what was virtually a public street-masque. On the city's Tollbooth, an extended west end (constructed for the visit) featured portraits of the monarchs of Scotland from Fergus to Charles I. The artist was George Jamesone, son of a master mason, who subsequently built a castle-like residence in Aberdeen that revealed a family heritage of exquisite stone work and carving.¹⁶⁰ Murray displayed his talents as royal architect with a range of fanciful embellishments on Holyrood Palace, including an array of carved stone spires, turrets, finials, and crowns. Drummond then led a bevy of poets in multi-lingual tributes.

On 18 June Charles I was crowned at Holyrood, where Bishop David Lindsay preached from the passage, "And all the people said, God save King Solomon."¹⁶¹ Unfortunately, Laud made his presence known (and obnoxious) by wearing ornate robes. Even worse, he shoved aside an improperly attired Scottish bishop. Murmurs about Papist candles, crosses, and altars soon wafted through Edinburgh. Determined to infuse Anglican rituals and apparel into the Scottish kirk, in the name of religious unity and harmony, the king made Laud a member of the Privy Council and backed his efforts to transform Presbyterianism into Episcopalianism.

With great ceremony, Charles opened Parliament and attended every session. On most issues, he had a majority of support but on two religious bills he met unexpected opposition. Under Laud's guidance, he introduced "An Act anent his Majesty's Prerogative and the Apparel of the Kingdom" and "A Ratification of Acts touching Religion." According to Masson, the first granted the king the right to regulate all clerical apparel, while the second confirmed all previous acts "by which the Kirk had been so far de-Presbyterianized."¹⁶² John Leslie, Sixth Earl of Rothes, was backed by a party of nobles, lairds, and burgesses, when he boldly fought against the acts. An

¹⁶⁰ D. Masson, *Drummond*, 196–99; D. Howard, *Scottish Architecture*, 122, 163–67.

¹⁶¹ J. Lawson, *Laud*, 17.

¹⁶² D. Masson, *Drummond*, 207–08.

irritated king then resorted to "the high-handed style he had learnt to use with his English Parliaments." He threatened them that he had a list of all members, and he would record each *No* vote. Rothes and "any of his adherants who were not frightened, then manfully voted *No* on both bills." Rothes further contested that, if the votes were fairly counted, the majority were *No* votes. It was perhaps the king's threats that influenced Rothes to later utilize secret Masonic communication networks when he opposed the king.¹⁶³

Neither Charles nor Laud recognized the potential seriousness of their religious intrusion into the Scottish national church. As Masson observes, the state of the Kirk of Scotland, as Laud found it, must have seemed very woeful:

It was certainly Episcopalian in name and in general organization . . . Many of the fiery parish-ministers, of the old Presbyterian school of Knox and Melville, had been crushed into silence, or driven into exile for their resistance to these innovations . . . All this was satisfactory so far, but more in appearance than in reality. Underneath this external texture of an Episcopal organization, the popular soul of the country was still fervidly, and even tumultuously, Presbyterian.¹⁶⁴

Though Charles had granted George Hay the title of Viscount Dupplin in 1627, he now perceived the chancellor as an "ald cankered gootishe man."¹⁶⁵ Naming him First Earl of Kinnoull, the king eased the ailing nobleman out of office while retaining his loyalty. Charles then appointed Archbishop Spottiswoode as chancellor. As noted earlier, Spottiswoode had earlier implemented James's Solomonic policy by building the beautiful Gothic church at Dairsie. Known as an outspoken opponent of "presbyterian austerity," he and the other prelates named to the Privy Council became targets of the radicals' wrath. Charles also made Edinburgh a bishopric and declared the church of St. Giles to be a cathedral, which would require substantial renovations.

To reinforce his architectural agenda which called for the repairs of castles and churches, Charles knighted James Murray, the first Master of Works, and made Sir William Alexander, father of the second Master of Works, First Earl of Stirling. When Charles visited Stirling, he was impressed by the baronial mansion designed by

¹⁶³ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 127.

¹⁶⁴ D. Masson, *Drummond*, 204.

¹⁶⁵ D. Howard, "Kinnoull Aisle," 40, 49.

Anthony Alexander for his father and then nearing completion. McGrail notes that the edifice, constructed close to the royal castle, is still one of the showpieces of Stirling: "It is in the French style, with a profusion of conical summits and dormer windows ornamented with intricate mouldings, and is generally considered one of the finest examples of its architectural type in Scotland."¹⁶⁶ The new Earl of Stirling and his architect son were enthusiastic supporters of Laud's policy, which would soon earn them great enmity in Scotland.

While king and bishop made a progress through the country, they noted at each stop the state of architecture in the community. Charles would subsequently commission the artist Alexander Keirincx to make architectural paintings of Seton Palace, Falkland Palace, and other impressive Scottish buildings.¹⁶⁷ Probably during a visit to Ancram on 24 June, he elevated his old friend and present companion Robert Kerr to become the First Earl of Ancram.¹⁶⁸ On 8 July Charles, Laud, and Ancram arrived at Perth, where they lodged with the new Earl of Kinnoull.¹⁶⁹ His retirement as chancellor now allowed Kinnoull to begin planning his spectacular Solomonic tomb, in collaboration with the Mylnes, which would embody Stuart and Masonic themes. Kinnoull's friend Henry Adamson had earlier composed *The Muses Threnodie* in anticipation of the royal visit. Despite Adamson's Rosicrucian prediction that Charles would enable the Freemasons to rebuild the bridge over the Tay, the poet's "second sight" had failed to envision the continuing delays in funding.

On 9 July Charles and his party watched a play in which two apprentices acted the parts of the river and city, who appealed to the king to repair Mylne's bridge. The character "Perth" presented his case:

Yes, Yes, it is the Perthian youths indeed . . .
 O'erjoy'd because they have King Charles the great
 Within their walls, to view their ruined state,
 With power and love can by himself alone
 Cause bind thy belly with a bridge of stone;

¹⁶⁶ Thomas McGrail, *Sir William Alexander, First Earl of Stirling* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1940), 154.

¹⁶⁷ Scottish National Portrait Gallery: informational notes accompanying Scottish paintings by Keirincx.

¹⁶⁸ R. Kerr, *Correspondence*, I, xviii.

¹⁶⁹ Henry Adamson, *The Muses Threnodie*, ed. James Cant (Perth: George Johnston, 1774), 118.

And shall thy now divided lands unite,
 To serve thy subjects with a paved street
 Which to thy country shall great comfort bring,
 And make us pray for great Charles our king.¹⁷⁰

The character "Tay" then replied with allusions to the earlier Rosicrucian prophecy:

Oh! do I wake, or is it but a dream?
 How do I tremble at King Charles' name!
 Then humbly here I prostrate at his feet,
 For now I see the prophecy complete:
 In elder times it long since was foretold
 That he my streams should by a bridge infold;
 And well I knew that none durst bar my flood;
 Nor was their any but King Charles the good,
 As heaven ordains, none can the fates eschew . . .

It is unknown whether Henry Adamson had a hand in the apprentices' skit, or whether he presented Charles with a copy of *The Muses Threnodie*. Adamson would later send the manuscript to Ancram's close friend Drummond of Hawthornden, who greatly admired the poem. After leaving Perth, the king did try to fulfill the prophecy, for he continued to urge the funding of the bridge.

As a Rosicrucian enthusiast, Ancram would certainly have appreciated the Masonic and prophetic allusions of the Perthians. He was also pleased when Charles honored two more practitioners of white magic who were well-known adepts of Rosicrucianism—George Erskine of Innerteil (continued as Chief Justice) and Sir David Lindsay (named First Earl of Balcarres). Balcarres's patent was dated 11 July 1633, Holyrood House, and given "in regard of the good services done to His Majesty and his late Royal Father, of blessed memory, by him and his predecessors."¹⁷¹ As noted earlier, Balcarres's father Lord Menmuir had worked with Schaw on James's architectural projects in the 1590's. Balcarres was a close friend of Erskine and Ancram, who allowed him to copy their Scots-English translations of the *Fama* and *Confessio*. Ten volumes of Balcarres's Rosicrucian and Hermetic manuscripts survive today.¹⁷²

¹⁷⁰ T. Marshall, *History*, 177–78.

¹⁷¹ J. Small, "Sketches," 420–21.

¹⁷² National Library of Scotland: MSS. ACC 9769. Personal Papers from the Earl of Crawford and Balcarres.

That Balcarres's transcription of the Rosicrucian treatises was made in 1633 suggests a connection with the king's visit. As a confidante of Drummond, who planned the poetic tributes for the visit, he may have been aware of the Rosicrucian-Masonic prophecy in Adamson's poem. Balcarres's descendant and family historian Lord Lindsay noted that "it is not impossible indeed that he may have become a brother of the 'Rosy Cross,' if indeed that celebrated society ever existed."¹⁷³ In Balcarres's notebooks there are discussions of Pythagorean mathematics, the Temple in Jerusalem, and Serlio's architectural drawings, and it seems certain that he was a Freemason. His future son-in-law, Sir Robert Moray, combined Rosicrucian studies with Masonic membership, and he was close to Balcarres's family.

In 1634, evidently inspired by his Scottish visit, Ancram merged his Rosicrucian and Masonic interests when he made a manuscript translation of Schweigardts' *Speculum Sophicum Rhodostautotica*, which included the axioms of the "singularly illuminated fraternity of the *Rosae Crucis*," much Hebrew lettering, and a fold-out ink drawing of the "Collegium Fraternitatis."¹⁷⁴ In the same year, a similar kind of merger was possibly made by Robert Fludd, after the publication of *Clavis Philosophiae* with its identification of Frizius as a Scot and its claim that the Rosicrucians now go under a different name (the Wise). Fludd's residence on Coleman Street, City of London, was close to the Masons' Hall, and in an inventory of the company's holdings made in 1663 there was listed "one book with the constitutions that Mr. Fflood gave."¹⁷⁵ (Unfortunately, the date of the donation was not given). That Fludd—like the Scottish students of Rosicrucianism—was honored by the king reinforces the case for Charles's own interest in the ideals of the illuminated fraternity.

When the king returned to London on 20 July, Laud stayed on in Scotland to make a tour of inspection of the churches. When he arrived at St. Andrews, "the monuments of reforming fanaticism, effected by Knox, met his eye, in the sacrilegious demolition of the venerable cathedral."¹⁷⁶ Everywhere he saw "dilapidated and squalid"

¹⁷³ Lindsay, *Lives of Lindsays*, II, 4.

¹⁷⁴ National Library of Scotland: Newbattle Collection: MS.5774.

¹⁷⁵ E. Conder, *Hole Craft*, 179. The donor may have been Robert's nephew, Dr. Lewen Fludd.

¹⁷⁶ J. Lawson, *Laud*, 29; "William Laud," *DNB*.

church edifices, which were always unadorned and ill-furnished. On one occasion, when a local official explained that the architectural change had been made at the Reformation, Laud remarked that "it was not a reformation but a deformation."¹⁷⁷ As Masson observes, the Reformers' destruction was compounded by "the sacrilegious rapacity of the nobles" who expropriated church properties.¹⁷⁸ Laud knew that James had tried to restore beautiful architecture and that Charles was determined to carry on his father's policy—though he did not know how differently many Scots perceived the Anglicized Charles from the always Scottish James. Rather than learning to temper his demands for conformity, when shown the resistance that would be provoked, Laud returned to England determined that the Scots, from the bishops down to the craftsmen, must "receive lessons in the true Beauty of Holiness."

When Laud arrived in London in August, Charles was delighted to name him Archbishop of Canterbury, to replace the recently deceased and much disliked George Abbot. King and archbishop then conferred on the state of churches in Scotland, and on 11 October they wrote to the Privy Council in Edinburgh, ordering them to "raze with diligence" certain walls within the church of St. Giles, in order for "the largenesse of the fabrick" to appeare and thus represent appropriately its new cathedral status and functions.¹⁷⁹ Other public buildings must be constructed or renovated. However, opposition immediately surfaced to some of these projects. In December, a party of craftsmen, led by the stonemason John Colt, attempted to obey their bishop's orders to repair the kirk and bellhouse of Kilspindie. They were then attacked by the local Presbyterian minister, who menaced the workmen, tore down the scaffold, and took away their worklooms. When the masons tried to defend the project, the minister "patt violent hands in his person, buffeted him on the face, uttering manie contumelious speeches," until he "so terified and affrighted the said Johne Colt that he darre not anie longer serve at that warke." The Bishop of Dunkeld and Colt protested to the Privy Council in January, but the members—perhaps resentful of Laud's intrusions into their affairs—did not prosecute the minister.

¹⁷⁷ "William Laud," *DNB*.

¹⁷⁸ D. Masson, *Drummond*, 205.

¹⁷⁹ *Reg. Privy. Council. Scot.*, 2nd s., V, 137, 189.

It was probably this case that provoked the king in January 1634 to grant extended powers for James Murray and Anthony Alexander, who were ordered to supervise all the trades connected with building. Stevenson argues that the Masters of Works were determined to block St. Clair's "attempt to exercise jurisdiction over masons and hammermen by themselves gaining jurisdiction over all trades even remotely connected with building."¹⁸⁰ However, it is unclear why St. Clair and his masonic supporters were considered a threat, for there is no surviving evidence of his stance or role in the religious controversies provoked by the Laudian program. The king granted to Murray, Alexander, and their successors power over all craftsmen and artificers "belonging to building within the kingdome," who included masons, hammermen, smiths, wrights, slaters, glaziers, plumbers, painters, shipwrights, coopers, pike and spear makers, etc. The masters could examine and discipline these artisans for "any point of their calling or trade concerning building or who doth not fulfill and keep their covenant or contract by word or write . . . or who doth neglect or run away."

Meanwhile, in London, Charles received public support for his policies from the Inns of Court, who commissioned Inigo Jones and James Shirley to produce a masque, *The Triumph of Peace*, performed on 3 February. Charles had solicited the Inns to demonstrate their opposition to the Puritan barrister William Prynne, who had attacked theatrical performances and players in *Histriomastix* (1633). His comment, "Women actors notorious whores," was construed as an insult to the queen, who enjoyed acting.¹⁸¹ The imprisonment and harsh treatment of Prynne, a member of Lincoln's Inn, intimidated the legal profession into spending lavishly on the public procession and masque, which praised the return to earth of Peace, Law, and Justice, under the benevolent Carolinian regime. With this production, Charles began to utilize the masque in a more public manner, in order to expand its pacific message to a broader audience. A resentful Puritan would later claim that "the courtiers invited the citizens' wives to those shews, on purpose to defile them."¹⁸²

¹⁸⁰ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 63. Subsequent spelling modernized.

¹⁸¹ G. Parry, *Golden Age*, 192–93.

¹⁸² Sir Edward Peyton, *The Divine Catastrophe of the Kingly Family of the House of Stuarts* (1652); rpt. in W. Scott, *Secret History*, II, 369.

On 4 February, one day after the masque, Jones met with the Commission for Pious Uses, which considered the "best wayes and meanes for the advancing the worke intended for the reparacion of the Cathedrall Church of St. Paule."¹⁸³ Guided by Laud, the Commission asked Jones to serve as surveyor of the project, without pay. A survey was to be taken of the old stones already prepared for the work, and any that had been borrowed were to be reclaimed. New stones would come from quarries selected by Jones. However, the work was not to begin until £10,000 were in the bank. In order to build public support for their architectural agenda, Charles and Jones devised a new masque, *Coelum Britannicum*, which stressed the importance of sacred architecture to the spiritual welfare of the nation. Sharpe stresses that the masque was not an empty show for the self-enhancement of the king's majesty, for Charles believed that art and architecture performed an essentially moral function, which could elevate men to their higher nature:

The masque was the fullest expression of the belief that culture might inculcate values to be emulated—by courtiers and ultimately those beyond . . . [Thus], the theme of Thomas Carew's *Coelum Britannicum* was reform at court and throughout the realm.¹⁸⁴

Given this political and moral purpose, it is provocative that *Coelum Britannicum* would have a strikingly new "Masonic" resonance. Moreover, there is evidence that Nicholas Stone, master mason, helped produce the scenic props.¹⁸⁵

On 18 February Jones collaborated with Carew in the spectacular production, which combined Hermetic themes from Bruno's *Spaccio della Bestia Trionfante* (1584) with architectural imagery of ruined and restored buildings and temples. Carew worked directly from Bruno's text, in which the gods call an assembly to reform themselves and the celestial images through Egyptian-Hermetic magic. The masque called for three scenes of architectural composition, in which the first identified the breakdown of architecture with the collapse of civilization. According to Carew,

¹⁸³ J. Gotch, *Inigo Jones*, 171.

¹⁸⁴ Kevin Sharpe, "The Image of Virtue: the Court and Household of Charles I, 1625–1642," in D. Starkey, ed., *English Court*, 258–59.

¹⁸⁵ S. Orgel and R. Strong, *Inigo Jones*, I, 38.

The curtain . . . which flying up on the sudden, discovered the Scaene, representing old Arches, old Palaces, decayed walls, parts of Temples, Theaters, Basilica's and Therme, with confused heaps of broken Columnes, Bases, Coronices and Statues, lying as underground, and altogether resembling the ruines of some great City of the ancient Romans, or civiliz'd Brittaines. That strange prospect detain'd the eyes of the spectators, when to a loud Musicke *Mercury* [*Hermes*] descends . . .¹⁸⁶

Mercury then praises the king and queen, "Before whose Throne three warlike nations bend/Their loving knees." Their "Pallace is become the envy'd patterne of this underworld."

Following the architectural destruction of the opening, the civilizing influence of the king was celebrated in two restorative scenes which reflected the recent experiences of Charles and Laud in the mountains of Scotland. Drummond had featured symbolic mountains in the coronation pageants in Edinburgh, and much festivity took place on the spectacular promontory of Arthur's Seat. In the anti-masque, "the naturall Inhabitants of this Isle, antient Scots and Irish, dance a martial number," only to be pacified by the rising of a sacred mountain out of the earth:

. . . there began to arise out of the earth the top of a hill, which by little and little grew to be a huge mountaine that covered all the Scaene; the under-part was wild and craggy, and above somewhat more pleasant and flourishing: about the middle part of this Mountaine were seated the three kingdomes of *England, Scotland, and Ireland* . . . At a distance above these sate a young man . . . holding in his hand a Cornucopia fill'd with corne and fruits, representing the Genius of these kingdomes.¹⁸⁷

After the Genius and Kingdoms sing, "the underpart of the Rocke opens, and out of a Cave are seene to come the Masquers." Then, Jones produced a spectacular conclusion to the scene:

. . . there appeares in the further part of the heaven comming down a pleasant Cloud, bright and transparent, which . . . embraceth the Genius, but so as through it all his body is seene; and then rising againe with a gentle motion beares up the Genius of the three kingdomes, and being past the Airy Region, perceth the heavens and is no more seene: At that instant the Rocke with the three kingdomes on it sinkes, and is hidden in the earth.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁶ T. Carew, *Poems*, 155.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 176.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 178-79.

This image of the symbolic mountain, which emerges and disappears, would later appear in the rituals of *Écossais* lodges, and its origins would long puzzle Masonic historians. In 1782 General Charles Rainsford, initiate of the Royal Order of Heredom of Kilwinning, explained that Mount Heredom exoterically referred to a mountain in northern Scotland but esoterically to the Hebrew characters for *Har Adonai*—i.e., “‘Mons Domini,’ Mount of God; ‘Malchuth’ being ‘Kingdom,’ the tenth Sephira of the Kabbalistic system.”¹⁸⁹ He also revealed that the symbolism was contributed by Jewish Masons. In 1875 Kenneth Mackenzie, a Scottish initiate of Rose-Croix Masonry, discussed the shadowy tradition of Mount Heredom:

Heredom.—A word of doubtful signification in Masonry. it has long been associated with the Royal Order of Heredom in Scotland, with the word Heroden as a Scottish mountain, and from the Greek words *holy* and *house*; thus the title of Rose Croix of Heredom would convey the meaning of Rosy Cross of the Holy House. But the whole subject is very obscure.¹⁹⁰

Other Masonic historians associated the rite with the medieval crusaders who returned from Jerusalem to Scotland, bringing with them the ancient Jewish traditions of the Temple mount.¹⁹¹ Whether this legend was current in Scottish Freemasonry in 1633 is unknown; it may have been developed after the fall of the Stuarts, when memories of Inigo Jones’s great masque were preserved in the lodges of the Jacobite diaspora.

Charles himself danced in *Coelum Britannicum* and it was considered the most successful of all Jones’s productions. However, the masque did not appease the king’s opponents, for the surly Presbyterian Peyton charged that “the masks and playes at Whitehal were used onely for incentives of lust,” especially to aid courtiers in the seduction of citizens’ wives.¹⁹² It also failed to accelerate the fund-raising for St. Paul’s—the king’s prime hope for the moral influence of architecture. On 15 July Laud’s Commission for Pious Uses admonished the Lord Mayor of London, as well as sheriffs and justices of peace throughout the kingdom, about their delays in collecting sufficient

¹⁸⁹ Gordon Hills, “Notes on the Rainsford Papers in the British Museum,” *AQC*, 26 (1913), 99.

¹⁹⁰ K. Mackenzie, *Royal Masonic*, 308.

¹⁹¹ A.E. Waite, *New Encyclopaedia*, I, 317.

¹⁹² W. Scott, *Secret History*, II, 369.

funds. The Commissioners “expect their long delay to be recompensed with more fruitful return,” especially since “the King taking contentment in the good progress of the work, and finding the charge to rise higher than at first was conceived, is pleased to undergo the entire charge of building the west end of the fabric.”¹⁹³ Despite the royal example, contributions lagged.

Throughout this period of rebuilding St. Paul’s, Jones worked closely with the Masons’ Company, and there was some masonic interchange between London and Edinburgh. On 3 July 1634 John Mylne the younger—son of the king’s master mason in Scotland—attended a lodge in Edinburgh, where two sons of the king’s secretary for Scotland were given the fellow craft or second degree.¹⁹⁴ Anthony Alexander, co-Master of Works, and William Lord Alexander were evidently initiated earlier with the apprentice or first degree. Could that have taken place in London? Because their father, the Earl of Stirling, worked so closely with Charles, it seems certain that there was some royal purpose in the masonic elevation of the Alexander sons. Another nobleman, Sir Alexander Strachan of Thornton, an energetic entrepreneur entrusted by the king “to farm Crown revenues,” was also made a fellow craft.¹⁹⁵ Over the next years, more courtiers joined the lodge in what Stevenson calls “a fascinating development.” These were “men evidently prepared to take a lasting interest in the lodge,” and their presence exemplified “John Mylne’s ideal of architecture as uniting the top and the bottom of society.”¹⁹⁶

The design and carving of Kinnoull’s tomb in Perthshire expressed the social mobility and Solomonic ideals of Stuart Freemasonry. Before his death in 1634, Kinnoull worked with the Mylnes on plans for his spectacular monument, which portrayed the secular entrepreneur in bold and egalitarian pose, within a framework of royalist, chivalric, universalist, and Solomonic symbols. Praised by Dr. Arthur Johnston (physician to the king) as “the wise Licurgus of our Time,/The great and grave Dictator of our clime,” the earl embodied the paradoxical nature of Scottish Masonry. Howard notes that Kinnoull’s

¹⁹³ *CSP. Domestic (1634–35)*, 150.

¹⁹⁴ D. Stevenson, *First Freemasons*, 26–27.

¹⁹⁵ On Strachan’s fund-raising schemes and loyalty to the crown, see Allan Macinnes, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanted Movement, 1625–1641* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1991), 68–71, 93–94, 139.

¹⁹⁶ D. Stevenson, *First Freemasons*, 28.

position was “strategically ambiguous: a democratic ephor who appeared at the same time to reinforce the Stewart monarchy’s belief in the divine right of kings.”¹⁹⁷ That ambiguity became more problematic for Kinnoull’s successors.

The serious challenges facing royalist Freemasons in Scotland were demonstrated on 9 September 1634, when James Mylne—kinsman of John—witnessed an attack upon a party of working masons by local antagonists. A complaint was brought to the Privy Council by John Broun, “Mason, servant to Patrick Urquhart of Lethintie,” that while he and his men were carrying out “their master’s work and without any offence given,” they were beaten until they were unable to continue “their master’s service.”¹⁹⁸ On 29 November the death of the long-serving Master of Works, Sir James Murray, meant that Anthony Alexander now gained the top position. Two days later, Alexander’s servant set out for London, carrying a draft that confirmed Alexander as “sole master” and requested the king’s signature. Two weeks later, Alexander himself travelled to London, where he gained the royal imprimatur on 15 December. Did he also consult with Inigo Jones and Nicholas Stone about Masonic affairs in London?

The king was soon angered to learn that William St. Clair opposed his grant to Alexander and managed to persuade the commissioners of the exchequer to halt the process of passing it through the seals. On 27 February 1635 Charles wrote to the commissioners and expressed his indignation at St. Clair’s “pretending ane heritable charge of the Maissones of our said kingdome, though we have never given warrant for strengthening of aney heritable right.” Only four years earlier, Charles had been willing to sanction St. Clair’s claim, but now he was determined to follow James’s policy of abolishing all hereditary offices. He did agree to an investigation of St. Clair’s case, but he insisted on the claimant producing his documents. Charles then added an important order to the commissioners:

And we will likeways for the better clearing of the said business that you examine the masons of that our kingdom, and that not by papers whereunto either of the parties may have procured ther hands in a private way, but that you give order to the magistrates of every town and to the sheriffs of every shire or to any other officers whom you

¹⁹⁷ D. Howard, “Kinnoull Aisle,” 40, 49.

¹⁹⁸ *Reg. Privy Council. Scotland.*, 2nd s., V, 424.

shall think fit, that so they, having called before them and heard the said masons, may report unto you what they shall find in the same.¹⁹⁹

For a fraternity that prided itself on secrecy, this royal charge must have been alarming. In order to strengthen the case of the royalist masons, the king knighted Anthony Alexander in a ceremony at Whitehall.²⁰⁰ Anthony then compiled a list of masons and wrights whom he renounced, evidently because of their collusion with radical Presbyterians. In April he sent this list to London but, for unknown reasons, the systematic national survey of the organization and rights of masons was never carried out. Fueled by local resentment at attempted control from London, St. Clair was able to muster enough support to keep the controversy brewing for another year.

Meanwhile in London, Jones was able to bring one major work to completion—the queen’s chapel at Somerset House. On 10 December 1635 an inaugural mass was held which provoked intense admiration or hostility, depending on the religious perspective of the viewer. The Capuchins who served the chapel had commissioned a Flemish sculptor who had recently studied in Rome, and he produced an altar and decorations that imitated the masque designs of Jones. There was a machine to exhibit the holy sacrament, placing it in a “Paradise of Glory,” while within the arch there was a series of receding ovals, all painted with angels and brilliantly lighted. Colvin notes that,

Lighting and music heightened this illusionist perspective in such a way as to offer a quasi-visionary experience. It all sounds very like the machinery of a masque and that was the impression given at the time. “Such a glorious scene,” wrote the Rev. Mr. Gerrard to the Earl of Strafford, “built over their new altar. *Inigo Jones* never presented a more curious Piece in any of the Masks at *Whitehall*.”²⁰¹

The queen’s chapel, with all its “Papistical” glory, provoked enormous resentment among Puritans.

While Laud continued his campaign for the “Beauty of Holiness,” he also tried to cooperate with John Dury’s irenic mission on the Continent. From Frankfurt Dury had written Laud to inform him

¹⁹⁹ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 64. Spelling modernized.

²⁰⁰ T. McGrail, *William Alexander*, 11.

²⁰¹ H. Colvin, *History*, IV, 265–66.

that "Since the death of the King of Sweden the Churches in Germanie have cast their hopes next to God upon the church of England; desiring it to mediat in the businesse of Ecclesiasticall unitie." To answer suspicions that he served a hidden political agenda, Dury affirmed that he worked only from a private calling. Then, appealing to Laud's self-image as a patron of architecture, he wrote:

... if from these [humble] beginnings, God will raise a better & more stately building to his glorie, by your meanes y't are eminent instruments of his workes, & Master builders in the Church of England; I doubt not but hee will put in the heart his Majestie our Gracious Sovereine, by your means also the best course which is to bee taken ... that both here & elsewhere Schismaticall & factious Spirits being put to silence ...²⁰²

Infused with architectural enthusiasm after his visit to Scotland, Laud would be flattered by Dury's portrayal of him as a "Master builder."

In November 1633 Dury returned to London, now much chastened by the military destruction and sectarian hostility in Germany. Like his disillusioned colleagues on the Continent, he increasingly interpreted political and ecclesiastical affairs in mystical and millenarian terms. He was aware, but did not inform Laud, that Johann Fridwall was embarking for London to communicate to an English nobleman that the Antillians' alchemist would demonstrate the *Secretum Lapidis philosophorum*, if travelling expenses were provided.²⁰³ Thus, he probably hoped to take advantage of the Hermetic interests of his uncle Ramsay and other courtiers in London. As in his earlier visit, Dury moved in with Ramsay, who was currently undertaking a Rosicrucian treasure-finding scheme for the king, which involved digging up parts of Westminster Abbey.²⁰⁴ Laud's approval of such "magical" projects would later be used against him at his trial.

Through Ramsay's position as Gentleman of the Bedchamber, Dury gained the patronage of the Marquis of Hamilton, who urged king and archbishop to support his project to unify the Reformed

²⁰² G. Westin, *Negotiations*, 249–50.

²⁰³ D. Dickson, *Tessera*, 126.

²⁰⁴ Finding buried treasure was one of the alleged talents of the Rosicrucians. For an account of Ramsay's project, see William Lilly, *The Last of the Astrologers: Mr. William Lilly's History of his Life and Times*, ed. Katherine M. Briggs (1715; rpt. Ilkley: Scholar Press, 1974), 32; also *Cal. State Papers. Domestic* (1635), 332.

churches.²⁰⁵ Charles agreed but Laud insisted that Dury undergo ordination as an Anglican minister. Dury, who had long doubted the authenticity of his foreign ordination, was happy to receive this sign of legitimacy. Though Laud tried to gain financial support for Dury, he ultimately advised him, "Let those that have set you awork provide maintenance for you."²⁰⁶ Just who "those" were was not yet clear to the archbishop, for Dury determined to keep his radical contacts well hidden from his public patrons. In 1634–35 he made a secretive visit to Scotland, where he sought backing from dissident Presbyterians. After returning to Germany, Dury instructed his supporters to keep all their communications private and to employ Hartlib as their confidential agent. That Dury was receiving financial support from militant Protestants who opposed Laud at every step was one rationale for his concern with secrecy.²⁰⁷

At the same time, Dury's uncle Ramsay continued in the king's favor. In August 1635 Ramsay received another grant from Charles to look for treasure "supposed to be hidden in Kent, with a reservation of one-tenth thereof to his Majesty."²⁰⁸ But Ramsay was not the only Rosicrucian who enjoyed the king's patronage. In late 1634 Dr. Arthur Dee returned to London from Russia, where he had carried on the magical experiments of his father. Dee's alchemical treatise *Fasciculus Chemicus* had been published at Paris in 1631, and it revealed his studies in Lullist traditions of Cabala and alchemy. He also brought from Russia his manuscript treatise, "Arca arcanorum abstrusae hermeticae scientiae," dated 10 August 1634, which included an address to the "Fratribus Roseae Crucis."²⁰⁹ Like his father, Charles I had supported Dee's position in Russia and, on 13 November 1635, appointed him court physician, a post Dee held until the civil war.

In autumn 1635 the religious and architectural policies of Charles I received spectacular reinforcement, when Rubens's great canvases

²⁰⁵ Gilbert Burnet, *The Memoirs of the Lives and Actions of James and William, Dukes of Hamilton* (London: J. Grover, 1677), 407–08.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, xxxviii, 295.

²⁰⁷ On Dury's "weather-cock" loyalty, see Anthony Milton, "'The Unchanged Peacemaker'? John Dury and the Politics of Irenicism in England, 1628–1643," in M. Greengrass, *Samuel Hartlib*, 95–117. Milton's important corrective to previous hagiographical treatment of Dury is based on his examination of the Hartlib Papers.

²⁰⁸ *CSP. Domestic* (1635), 332.

²⁰⁹ J. Appleby, "Arthur Dee," 100–01.

glorifying the Solomonic wisdom of James I were installed on the ceiling of the Banqueting House. The transactions between king and artist had been facilitated by the architect Gerbier. In "The Judgment of Solomon," James was enthroned in a niche flanked by the twisted columns of the Temple of Solomon, identified as Jachin and Boaz by the masons. Strong notes an allusion to the Hebraic-Egyptian wisdom of James in the decoration of his throne:

... in the First Book of Kings two women contend for a child. Solomon, in his wisdom, decreed that the infant should be divided between them, split in halves. In the ceiling panel the two contending women are England and Scotland, and the judgment of the new Solomon, James I, excels that of his Old Testament predecessor. He reconciles the contestants by commanding the Union of the crowns. The mighty wisdom of this action is emphasized by the sphinx which makes up part of his throne.²¹⁰

Though Jones was the major source for Rubens's themes, Charles and Laud had contributed to the final plans.

Meanwhile in Scotland, the rival claims to masonic leadership between Sir Anthony Alexander and William St. Clair continued to fester. During 1635, while Charles heard reports from both sides, the Alexanders strengthened their relationship with the Mylne family. On 2 June Henry and Anthony Alexander joined Alexander Strachan and John Mylne at the Edinburgh lodge, where they gave the fellow craft degree to Alexander Mylne, currently engaged as a sculptor on the new Parliament House and other public buildings commissioned by the king.²¹¹ By May 1636 Charles was determined to finalise the case, so he instructed the chancellor in Scotland to "seal Alexander's grant unless investigation had proved that this would infringe anyone's just rights."²¹²

However, Charles would soon learn that the masons were not easily controlled. On 18 July the Scottish Exchequer ordered the rivals to "settle the business friendly," and appointed the Bishop of Brechin to mediate. The emergence of new documents and repeated delays confused and frustrated the king, who attempted to show some favor to St. Clair by appointing him "judge and overseer of the hammermen," only to be countermanded by the Exchequer who ruled

²¹⁰ R. Strong, *Britannia*, 19.

²¹¹ D. Lyon, *History*, 100.

²¹² D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 64-65.

for Alexander. Even though Alexander won a victory and became official Master of Works, no one denied that St. Clair had certain hereditary and lawful rights for his masonic role.

In 1636 Alexander attempted to follow in the footsteps of William Schaw and implement a complete reorganization of the building trades by formulating the Falkland Statutes. On 26 October in a meeting held at Falkland, Alexander revived Schaw's title of General Warden of the Freemasons but expanded his provenance to all "Artificers of Buildings." Companies of the building crafts were to be established all over Scotland, except where they already existed, and they would examine all prospective members, who upon consent of six master masons would be admitted to the craft. Each company was to elect a warden or deacon, who was to have power to suppress all unqualified "villains" and act against "all sorts of deceitful meetings of Masons belonging to any of the said Arts."²¹³ "A general correspondence" would be maintained among the companies, who would meet at least once a quarter.

Stevenson speculates that Alexander planned to make the lodges of Freemasons into "elite cores of initiates within the companies, the masons forming a craft aristocracy by right of being Vitruvian masons/architects." Moreover, Alexander may have hoped to revive the high Renaissance ideals of Schaw—i.e., stress on the Lullist Art of Memory and Cabalistic-Hermetic symbolism. On 14 January 1637 Alexander attended a lodge meeting at Aitchison's Haven, where members signed the Falkland Statutes. On 15 May he issued orders for local artificers to appear before him at Linlithgow Palace to be formed into companies, "in order to cure the great abuses and delinquencies that existed through unfree men practising crafts." Similar orders were sent to Glasgow and other towns, and on 27 April 1637 a masonic court was held at Stirling Castle, with Alexander presiding as warden.

Perhaps in support of these masonic reforms, Henry Adamson sent a manuscript copy of *The Muses Threnodie* to Drummond of Hawthornden, who was a close friend of the Alexanders. However, Drummond was not aware that Adamson died in May, and he did not send his appreciative response until 12 July. Addressing "my worthy friend Mr. Henry Adamson," Drummond congratulated him for his antiquarian service to Scotland:

²¹³ Ibid., 68–69. Spelling modernized.

Your two champions, noble zanys, discover to us many of the antiquities of this country, more of your ancient town of Perth, setting down her situation, founders, her huge colosse or bridge, walls, fousies, aqueducts, fortifications, temples, monasteries, and many other singularities. Happy hath Perth been in such a citizen, not so other towns in this kingdom, by want of so diligent a searcher and perserver of their fame from oblivion.²¹⁴

Drummond urged Adamson to publish the poem, which would certainly have reinforced the king's campaign to improve the architecture of Scotland and Laud's campaign for the "Beauty of Holiness." By the time *The Muses Threnodie* was published in February 1638, the "Mason Word" had taken on a new political significance.

In 1637 the king lost another loyal supporter and Rosicrucian enthusiast when Robert Fludd died on 8 September. For six years, Fludd had worked on a Cabalistic-Hermetic treatise, *Philosophia Mosaica*, which was published posthumously in 1638. Though he did not refer explicitly to the Rosicrucians, his concluding sentence, "*sub umbra alarum tuarum*, I will sing the Truth under the shadow of thy wings," repeated the final words of the *Fama*, the epigraph of the *Speculum Sophicum Rhodostauroticon*, and other Rosicrucian tracts.²¹⁵ For readers familiar with Rosicrucian literature, his final work was a testimony to the movement's ideals. If Fludd was affiliated with Freemasonry, his extensive discussion of Jewish mystical concepts provides a clue to the emergence of complex Cabalistic themes in the Masonic correspondence of Robert Moray in the 1650's.

Using Reuchlin's Cabalistic extracts, especially from the *Sepher Yetzirah* and *Zohar*, Fludd argued that the Divine Sophia (or *Shekinah*) was the fountainhead of arithmetic, geometry, architecture, naval architecture, and all mechanic arts.²¹⁶ Demonstrating the mystery of the world's creation "by way of an arithmetical progression," he utilized emblematic triangles composed of numbered dots that revealed "the manner of the world's Fabrick." These triangles seem to foreshadow the *Écossais* Masons' signature of triangle composed of three dots. The divine Sophia is "this spirituall Cornerstone" as well as the "principle Tabernacle of this all-acting and creating Spirit in the

²¹⁴ H. Adamson, *Muses Threnodie*, preface.

²¹⁵ F. Yates, *Rosicrucian Enlightenment*, 55–58; Robert Fludd, *Mosaicall Philosophy* (London: Humphrey Mosely, 1659), 300.

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 22, 51, 61, 73.

World." Claiming that Plato, Pythagoras, and Hermes Trismegistus received their wisdom from Moses, Fludd also praised the "learned *Rabbies* of our age," who teach the secret mystical language hidden in Hebrew letters.

While Alexander carried out masonic reforms in Scotland, Inigo Jones defended the Masons' Company in London against challenges by plasterers and impressments by the navy.²¹⁷ He got the support of Laud in his efforts, for the archbishop was determined that Jones's work on St. Paul's would proceed without interference or "drifting" craftsmen. In 1637 Laud praised the architecture of the porch on St. Mary's Church in Oxford, where Nicholas Stone designed "the Noble Frontispiece with Twisted Columns," representing the Jachin and Boaz of Solomon's Temple.²¹⁸ Stone also prepared to send his son to Italy, where the youth would observe Italian masons at work and study the Arch of Titus (with its Jewish emblems), the twisted pillars at St. Peter's, the Egyptian obelisks, and the great stone mole at Genoa.²¹⁹

Unfortunately, all these efforts at masonic reform and architectural achievement would founder on the rocks of Laud's religious intrusions in Scotland. In April 1637 the new Scottish Book of Common Prayer, written by the Scottish bishops under the direction of Laud, was published in the north. An Episcopal edict served notice that the Service Book would be read in all churches in and around Edinburgh on 23 July. The king was soon shocked to learn that disaffected nobles had joined with Presbyterian conventiclers and craftsmen to organize a riotous protest at St. Giles Cathedral.²²⁰ That Charles suspected some kind of masonic involvement in the protests is suggested by his sending David Ramsay to Edinburgh in August 1637, where Ramsay was initiated into the lodge as "one of the king's special servants."²²¹ Attending the ceremony were John Mylne, Strachan, and both Alexanders.²²²

²¹⁷ H. Colvin, *History*, IV, 119; J. Gotch, *Inigo Jones*, 173, 182.

²¹⁸ W. Spiers, *Note-book . . . Stone*, 70, 137.

²¹⁹ Diary of Nicholas Stone, junior; *ibid.*, 162, 172–76, 182.

²²⁰ A. Macinnes, *Charles I*, 158–60.

²²¹ D. Stevenson, *First Freemasons*, 27. Stevenson was unsure which David Ramsay was meant, but it seems certain that the king's clock-maker, alchemist, and Gentleman of the Bedchamber was the initiate.

²²² Harry Carr, *The Minutes of the Lodge of Edinburgh, Mary's Chapel, No. 1, 1598–1738* (London, 1962), 114.

Charles also summoned Anthony Alexander to London where, to his dismay, his General Warden of the Scottish Masons died from a sudden illness on 17 September. The death of Anthony was a great blow to his father, the Earl of Stirling, who was rapidly becoming the scapegoat for increasing troubles in Scotland. From his "special servant" Ramsay, Charles may have learned of the importance of rebuilding ties with the masons, many of whom shared the sentiments of the disaffected lords over Laud's religious intrusions. Thus, on 20 September Charles wrote that he was willing to listen to the St. Clair party and to learn more about the traditions of Freemasonry in Scotland. He had received a petition from "the masters, deacons, and freemen of the masone and hammermen," who convinced him that "the overseeing and judging of their trade did from many ages belong to the Lairds of Roslin," but the grant to St. Clair was stopped by "opposal of our M[aste]r of Work as derogatory to his office."²²³ In a conciliatory move, Charles asked the masons to send him their opinions so that he could make a satisfactory ruling.

Charles then turned his attention to the masonic needs of Perth. On 23 September he wrote to the Scottish Privy Council urging them to fund the rebuilding of the bridge at Perth—a project much-desired by John Mylne, a leader in the lodge at Edinburgh. The king's letter was unusual in its length and its stress on the religious purpose of bridge-building.²²⁴ Charles called for a commission of distinguished nobles to work with the burgesses of Perth, who would meet regularly to plan the design of the bridge, the gathering of workmen and materials, and the collection of funds from communities all over Scotland. The Privy Council then made clear that the appointments went to those nobles and citizens "who are persons in whom the said Lords repose special trust and credit." However, this effort to develop a loyalist group of citizens and craftsmen was undermined by the Privy Council's subsequent order on the same day (23 July), in which the lords recommended to the provost and authorities in Edinburgh "to advise with their Counsel anent the most conduceable means for settling the service booke within their kirks in a peaceable way."

²²³ British Library. Add. MS.23112.f.76r.; in D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 66. Spelling modernized.

²²⁴ *Reg. Privy Council. Scotland*, 2nd s., VI, 531–32.

Functioning as main mediator between the Privy Council, disaffected nobles, and king was Traquair, who also subscribed to the act for rebuilding the bridge at Perth on 23 September.²²⁵ Charles had great confidence in Traquair, and Laud informed Archbishop Spottiswoode that their communications must be kept secret: "his Majesty precisely commands, that this mutual relation between the Earl of Traquair and you be kept very secret, and made known to no other person, either clergy or lay."²²⁶ As Traquair attempted to build political, religious, and material bridges, he utilized his Masonic bonds with noblemen on both sides of the religious issues. Among the king's supporters, some distrusted his efforts to accomodate both sides and charged that Traquair "had the Masone word, among the nobilitie."²²⁷

On 13 October Traquair told Rothes, leader of the opposition to Laud's policies, about the accusation of Masonic intrigue. As Stevenson notes, Traquair interpreted the charge to mean his participation in "some secret bond—and one that bound men together for sinister purposes." Though Traquair argued back to the royalists that he was trying to win over the opposition to the king's interest, Charles sensed that he must firm up the loyalty of the masons. Thus, in late October he appointed Henry Alexander, Sir Anthony's younger brother, as Master of Works with the same powers as his predecessors. Henry then undertook a reorganization of the Stirling trades and crafts.²²⁸ As opposition to the king's policy intensified, Henry Alexander joined the lodge at Edinburgh in February 1638.

The divisions within Freemasonry and the nation soon ramified into Perth, where the town council debated on 27 November 1637 whether the still-unpublished *Muses Threnodie* should be dedicated to the Second Earl of Kinnoull or to the town council and magistrates.²²⁹ Given the architectural interests of the First Earl, whose flamboyant Solomonic tomb was well-known in Perth, his son was an appropriate dedicatee for the Masonic poem.²³⁰ However, the Catholic upbringing and suspected sympathies of Kinnoull *père* now

²²⁵ Ibid., VI, 697.

²²⁶ W. Laud, *Works*, VI, 439.

²²⁷ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 127.

²²⁸ T. McGrail, *William Alexander*, 11.

²²⁹ T. Marshall, *History*, 491.

²³⁰ D. Howard, *Scottish Architecture*, 205–06.

rendered his son a controversial dedicatee. Finally, on 12 February 1638 Adamson's tribute to the prophetic power of Rosicrucianism and the regenerative force of Freemasonry was published in Edinburgh and distributed in Perth. If the king read it, he would have found solace in Adamson's tribute to him as "the Lord's anointed," who gained his crown by Heaven's appointment, and whose "word will prove of powerful operation," as long as "he can have due information."²³¹ These loyal but cautionary words were followed by the prophecy of the "brethren of the rosie cross," who have "the mason word and second sight."

Throughout the autumn of 1637, the disaffected nobility rallied all classes of the nation to mount an organized resistance to the intrusion of Anglican and Popish religious innovations. In November the king ordered the Privy Council and College of Justice to leave the disorder of Edinburgh and to retreat to Linlithgow. Traquair got permission from the Council to return to Edinburgh and negotiate with the rebels, whom he begged to give no further offence to the king. In order to gain their trust, he apparently drew on his Masonic bond with some of them. The rebels then convinced the Council to allow them to utilize their "Tables" (representative delegations of locally elected nobles, gentry, and ministers) in formal negotiation with the Council and Crown. Macinness observes that "the inspiration for the disaffected's organisation may have been drawn as much from incipient freemasonry as from established administrative practices."²³²

Though Scottish monarchs from Mary of Guise to James VI had utilized their Masters of Work and masons in confidential missions before, the utilization of Masonic networks on a national scale for a popular cause was a major new development. On 23 February the Tables agreed unanimously to commission "a Band of mutuall asociatione for offence and defence." When published on 28 February the Band became known as the National Covenant. The document repeated the 1581 Covenant with its proclamation of Scotland's role as Hebraic preserver of the true religion and its denunciation of Popery. While the new Covenant called for removal of religious and

²³¹ H. Adamson, *Muses Threnodie*, 31.

²³² A. Macinness, *Charles I*, 168.

legal innovations imposed from London, it was traditionally monarchist in its political theory. What was striking was the near universality of its acceptance in Scotland, for people of all classes and walks of life signed it in Edinburgh, while copies were distributed for more signatures all over the country. In London, Ancram was distressed to learn that his son William, Earl of Lothian, participated in the Tables and signed the Covenant.²³³

Significantly, two beautifully illuminated copies were made by the skilled calligrapher William Aytoun, who signed himself "maison."²³⁴ Since 1631 Aytoun had served as master mason of Heriot's Hospital, where he demonstrated his skills in carving and dialing. The Aytoun family included many operative masons and at least one speculative Freemason—George Aytoun, a notary public, who became clerk of the lodge of Edinburgh in 1637–38, under the aegis of the Alexanders.²³⁵ However, Henry Alexander, the king's Master of Works, did not follow the Aytouns in support of the Covenant, for he refused to sign the populist and nationalist document. In March 1638 Alexander attended the lodge at Aitchison's Haven, where members again approved the Falkland Statutes, though perhaps reluctantly since they would surrender half the lodge's income to the General Warden. After his older brother's death in May, Henry left Scotland for England, probably to support his ailing and embattled father. For a time, it seemed that Freemasonry was to be controlled by the Covenanters or, at least, by those disaffected nobles who possessed the Mason Word.

While the Tables prepared the Covenant in Edinburgh, Charles and his masque-makers in London hoped to soothe the troubled times through the magic of "court hieroglyphics." On 7 January 1638 Jones collaborated with the poet William Davenant to produce *Brittania Triumphans*, which portrayed the king as "Britanocles," who utilized his wisdom, valor, and piety to bring "a real knowledge of all good arts and sciences" to his land.²³⁶ As usual, Jones expressed the king's benevolent influence in terms of architectural scenery. While Jones continued to defend his craftsmen and to solicit funds

²³³ R. Kerr, *Correspondence*, I, lv.

²³⁴ D. Stevenson, *First Freemasons*, 15.

²³⁵ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 199.

²³⁶ William Davenant, *The Dramatic Works of Sir William Davenant*, (Edinburgh: William Paterson, 1872), II, 265.

for their proper payment, the king also issued protection to them in 1638, when he gave a charter to the Company of Freemasons in London.²³⁷

Despite the benevolent magic of *Brittania Triumphans*, Charles soon learned that the protest movement in Scotland was rapidly expanding. Encouraged by the success of the National Covenant, the radicals added new demands in petitions to the king—the abolition of Episcopacy, free general assemblies, and regular Parliaments. In May 1638 Charles sent the Marquis of Hamilton to negotiate, but he was dismayed to learn that the Privy Council—now shorn of the bishops—sympathized with the Covenanters. On 22 September Hamilton presented to the Privy Council, the King's Covenant which made some concessions while maintaining Episcopacy. Among the commissioners appointed by Hamilton to require subscribers to the King's Covenant was Sir Patrick Ruthven, who left Swedish service in order to serve Charles in Scotland.²³⁸ However, on the same day as the new Covenant was proposed, the Glasgow Assembly was summoned, which expanded its protests to include attacks on the king's prerogative.

Throughout the year, the Covenanters had raised funds, collected arms, recruited troops, and organized an army. Agents travelled to Sweden, leading an alarmed Laud to note that "all the Scottish in Sweden have sworn the Covenant."²³⁹ Many seasoned veterans returned home, where they were rapidly integrated with the locals by General Alexander Leslie, a radical Presbyterian who had learned his tactics under Gustavus Adolphus. By winter 1638 Charles realized the seriousness of the Scottish rebellion, for such it had become, and he appointed Ruthven as king's mustermaster-general in Scotland. He hurriedly patched together a small army under Arundel, which prepared to move northwards. Among those recruited were many knights of the Family of Fancy—including Thomas Carew, John Mennes, James Smith, William Murray, and James Atkins. The latter two went to Scotland, Murray as negotiator with the Covenanters and Atkins as chaplain to Hamilton.²⁴⁰

In February 1639 Charles issued a proclamation declaring the religion of Scotland to be safe in his hands and asserting that the

²³⁷ N. Brett-James, *Growth*, 278.

²³⁸ "Patrick Ruthven," *DNB*.

²³⁹ W. Laud, *Works*, VI, 520.

²⁴⁰ T. Raylor, *Cavaliers*, 49, 59, 85, 157–65.

Covenanters were now aiming at the destruction of monarchical government. In March he journeyed to York, where he appealed to the Scottish people over the heads of the disaffected nobility. Moving on to Newcastle in May, the king found the English army's financial situation so precarious that his secretary, Sir John Coke, wrote, "If, now, David Ramsey can cooperate with his philosopher's stone, he would do a good service."²⁴¹ Even worse, Coke learned from an intercepted letter that the French favored the Scots, "after the old manner," and hoped to "take advantage of the time, and will not omit to do the best they can to foment our disorders for their own interests." Cardinal Richelieu actually responded to an appeal from leading Covenanters for Louis XIII to mediate between them and Charles I.²⁴² According to a hostile report from the royalist soldier Patrick Gordon, Richelieu was determined that Britain would at last "be a sufferer and no longer a beholder" of the Thirty Years War," and he utilized Colonel Robert Moray to carry out this plan.²⁴³

With Moray's entrance on the political stage, a major actor in the Stuart Masonic drama began to play his provocative role. A native of Perthshire, Moray received military training in France, where he served in the Scots Guard and then Sir John Hepburn's Scottish regiment which joined the French army in 1633. He probably became a Freemason through his role as quartermaster-general, for its mathematical and technological skills were the provenance of military masonry. At the same time, he developed an enthusiastic interest in architecture and its associated esoteric lore. Moray's talents were noticed by Richelieu, a learned patron of military and domestic architecture, who developed confidential relationships with master masons and their craftsmen.²⁴⁴ During a 1637 visit to London to inspect an engineering project, Moray observed the critical political situation and evidently up-dated Richelieu on Anglo-Scottish affairs. He then became a trusted agent of the cardinal. As a staunch Scottish patriot and moderate Presbyterian, Moray sympathized with

²⁴¹ *CSP. Domestic (1639)*, 143.

²⁴² Victor Tapié, *France in the Age of Louis XIII and Richelieu*, trans. D.M. Lockie (1952; London: Macmillan, 1974), 503n.41.

²⁴³ See Patrick Gordon, *Short Abridgement of Britane's Distemper*, written ca. 1647–50, but not published until 1844; Alexander Robertson, *The Life of Sir Robert Moray* (London: Longman's Green, 1922), 3–4.

²⁴⁴ *Richelieu et le Monde de l'Esprit*. Exhibition à Université de Paris en Sorbonne (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1985), 55–60, 363–70.

the Covenanters, though he was not anti-monarchical. Returning to Scotland in 1638, he was appointed quartermaster-general in the Covenanters' army. Among his military colleagues were the earls of Balcarres and Lothian (scions of "Rosicrucian" families) and many nobles who possessed the Mason Word.

By the time Charles arrived at Berwick, his undisciplined and reluctant troops faced an organized and committed Scottish army just across the border. Thus, he signed the Treaty of Berwick, which called for disbanding the armies and return of the king's castles to royal possession. Charles agreed to a future assembly to deal with ecclesiastical matters and a Parliament to deal with political affairs. The first "Bishops' War" was over, but the controversies that provoked it would only worsen in the months ahead. After the king returned to London, his depression and anger about the Scottish rebellion intensified, while the more radical Covenanters made increasingly militant demands. Seeking consolation and inspiration, the king turned to his masque-makers to exercise their benevolent magic for his agitated realm.

Thus, in late fall 1639, Jones and Davenant, who had served with the king's army in the north, collaborated on an especially spectacular masque. Performed on 21 January 1640, *Salmacida Spolia* presented Charles as Philogenes, lover of his people, whose "secret wisdom" would soothe the troubled waters of his kingdoms. The script made clear that Charles was concerned about the magical and millenarian claims of his opponents in the north:

Discord, a malicious fury, appears in a storm, and by the invocation of malignant spirits, proper to her evil use, having already put most of the world into disorder, endeavours to disturb these parts, envying the blessings and tranquility we have long enjoyed.

These incantations are expressed by those spirits in an Antimasque: who on a sudden are surprised, and stopt in their motion by a secret power, whose wisdom they tremble at, and depart as foreknowing that Wisdom will change all their malicious hope of these disorders into a sudden calm, which after their departure is prepared by a disperst harmony of music.²⁴⁵

In one of the antimasques, a comical figure appears, representing the utopian pretensions of the German and Dutch Rosicrucians, whose militant millenarianism has now infected Scotland:

²⁴⁵ W. Davenant, *Dramatic Works*, II, 308.

Wolfgangus Vandergoose, Spagyrick [chemist], Operator to the invisible Lady, styled the Magical sister of the Rosicross, with these receipts following, and many other rare secrets, undertakes in short time to cure the defects of nature, and diseases of the mind.²⁴⁶

The Rosicrucian doctor then offers a farcical list of cures and recipes, such as “Treacle of the gall of serpents” and the “liver of doves to initiate a neophyte courtier.” Summing them up is a bath made of catalogues from the Frankfurt book fair and a diet in which the patient “must refrain from all real knowledge, and only suck in vulgar opinions, using the fricasee of confederacy.” Among those who followed Wolfgangus Vandergoose were an ancient Irishman, an ancient Scotsman, an old-fashioned Englishman, four antique Cavaliers, and the invisible lady, magical sister of the Rosicross.

After the antimasques, the scene changes to “craggy rocks and inaccessible mountains,” which represent “the difficult way which heroes are to pass ere they come to the throne of Honour.” The path up the mountain represents levels of initiatory illumination, for through the mists of low nature the philosophers “do upper knowledge spy” (according to the Hermetic adage, “As below, so above”). Finally, the king’s “secret wisdom” overcomes the obstacles and reveals a magnificent scene of civic and ecclesiastical architecture. The terrestrial architecture is then mirrored in the celestial, as the music of the spheres descends. *Salmacida Spolia* featured Jones’s most spectacular effects, and Davenant boasted that it “was generally approved of, especially by all strangers that were present, to be the noblest and most ingenious that hath been done here in that kind.”²⁴⁷ Did the king hope that his higher Masonic wisdom—the “Royal Art” of Solomon—could overcome or subsume the lesser Rosicrucian wisdom? Despite his tolerance and even patronage of pacific Rosicrucians, his critics now drew upon the militant Rosicrucianism of radical Continental Protestants to subvert his Solomonian dreams.

On 12 September 1640 Charles and Laud lost one of their most loyal supporters, when the Earl of Stirling died in London. Despite the hostile accusations of Stirling’s critics that he was a mercenary profiteer, the earl died “insolvent.” Probably fearing demonstrations

²⁴⁶ Ibid., II, 315.

²⁴⁷ Ibid., II, 327.

by his father's enemies, Henry Alexander had his father's remains shipped secretly to Stirling, where they were buried in a nighttime ceremony in the High Church. Immediately after the burial, a burlesque "epitaph" was circulated throughout Scotland, in which predictions were made that the Alexanders' beautiful mansion would be pulled down and that Henry Alexander would "scorne to take ye name/Of M[aste]r of worke for very shame."²⁴⁸ The burlesque further pressured Henry to resign from his political positions, and it was followed by other satires that tried to erase the influence of the Alexander family in Scottish political and Masonic affairs.

This campaign by radical Presbyterians against the Alexanders' royalist Masons throws some light on the shadowy eighteenth-century tradition, preserved in the Clermont Rite, that David Ramsay became "Vicarius Magistraturae" of the secret Templar-Masonic order in 1640, a position he allegedly held until 1659, when he was succeeded by Charles II.²⁴⁹ That Ramsay, "the king's special servant," was both a Mason and a Rosicrucian provides a background for the effort by John Sadler, an English royalist, to persuade the militant Scottish Rosicrucians to give up their oppositionist campaign. In November 1640 Sadler, an eccentric Hebrew scholar and amateur physician, published *Masquerade du Ciel: presented to the Great Queene of the Little World. A Celestiall Map, representing the late commotions between Saturn and Mercury about the Northern Thule*. Dedicated to Henrietta Maria, the masque drew on Hermes Trismegistus, Roger Bacon, Geber, Lull, Ficino, Nostradamus, Campanella, and Scaliger to explain the cosmic patterns behind the turmoil in Thule (Scotland). Sadler revealed the perceived linkage between militant Rosicrucianism and Scottish opposition to Charles's religious policy:

From this near approach of Quicksilver to Gold (in Matter and Gravity) Some Sublimate Rosy-Crucian Alchymists, have made deep plots with Sulphur, to make their Mercury become Sol, of a Subject a King (in Mettals) of Quicksilver Gold. But True Mercury cannot harbour Trayterous inclinations: Hence their Sulphureous Devices, vanish like Powder Plots.²⁵⁰

²⁴⁸ T. McGrail, *William Alexander*, 186–87.

²⁴⁹ W. Zimmerman, *Von den alten*, 375.

²⁵⁰ [John Sadler], *Masquerade du Ciel* (London: R.B. for S.C., 1640), 22.

Utilizing his own magical expertise, Sadler made a series of royalist political predictions, but he was no match for the militant “Rosicrucian” opposition in Scotland, nor for the Puritan opposition in England.²⁵¹ One month after *The Masquerade du Ciel*, the House of Commons arrested Archbishop Laud. The “Beauty of Holiness” had become a treasonous crime, and Britain was headed towards civil war.

²⁵¹ “John Sadler,” *DNB*. He subsequently went over to the parliamentary side and became a favorite of Cromwell.

CHAPTER EIGHT

"OUR HIEROGLYPHIC KING" AND CIVIL WAR: *EIKON BASILIKE* VERSUS *EIKONOKLASTES* (1641–1655)

That the stone which some builders refuse
may become the headstone of the pillar.

—Charles I, *Eikon Basilike* (1649)

Thus is the solemn temple sunk agen
Into a Pillar, and conceal'd from men.

—Henry Vaughan, "Jacobs Pillow, and Pillar" (1650)

And the King intended to carry on Whitehall according to Jones's Plan, but was unhappily prevented by the Civil Wars: For the Parliament's Army conquer'd the King and Parliament too, and murdered him at his own Gate on 30 January 1649 . . .

Charles II. Stewart, succeeded his Father . . . In his Travels he had been made a Free Mason.

—James Anderson, *Constitutions of the Freemasons* (1738)

While a joint committee of Scottish and English commissioners met in London to work out peace proposals, Bishop Thornborough issued his last call to British citizens to remember the Solomonic dream of James I for a unified and peaceful island. In *A Discourse Shewing the Great Happinesse that Hath, and May Still Accrue to his Majesties Kingdoms of England and Scotland by Uniting them into One Great Britaine* (1641), Thornborough reminded Parliament that "the state of England and Scotland may bee resembled to the condition of Israel and Juda," for the "two kingdoms were at first both but one."¹ Despite the current polarizations, he urged English and Scots to show the world that "all Great Britaine is like Jerusalem, which is as a City, at unity within itselfe." By a "Pythagoricall Paligenesis," all good citizens must join together to resist the destroyers of the holy city. As the confidante of many Scottish Hermeticists, he seemed aware of the links between Covenanters and Masons:

¹ The *Discourse* was evidently published posthumously under the name of John Bristol; see *A Discourse* (London: R.H., 1641), 49, 130. The *DNB* lists Thornborough as author.

Some in these Earth-quakes of State have laboured to underprop the houses of both Realmes, others to pull them downe, saying as of Jerusalem, *Downe with it, downe with it, even to the ground*: Nay, I feare, the same hand that held a Spade, pretending to build a Wall, hath held a Sword to kill a Subject.²

However, the nationalist Masonic agitation in Scotland had unexpected ramifications in England. In the painful spring of 1641, Charles I watched helplessly as the militant party in Parliament ordered the imprisonment of Laud in the Tower and the trial of the archbishop's principle advisor, Thomas Wentworth, First Earl of Strafford. The earl had made an architectural name for himself through his projects in Yorkshire and an ambitious construction scheme in Ireland, where he served as Lord Deputy. He shared the Stuart belief that "good architecture made for the seemly exercise of good government," and he saw his restoration work at Dublin Castle as complementary to Laud's at St. Paul's Cathedral.³ Strafford hoped to implement Inigo Jones's building regulations in Ireland, and he aspired to equal him in architectural design—"without offence to Mr. Jones, or Pride in myself be it spoken, I take myself to be a very pretty architect too." To provide suitable accomodation for a projected royal visit, Strafford designed a great classical-Italian country house on the outskirts of Dublin.

Howarth observes that Strafford "was no match for Jones as a designer," but "he was his equal as a visionary of how architecture might express kingship." Working closely with his masons, Strafford restored churches, opened marble quarries, and encouraged masques, "that inventive type of temporary architecture." However, his Jonesian aspirations, which he discussed in his correspondence with Laud, now made him the target of iconoclastic wrath.⁴ While William Murray, John Mennes, and brothers of the Fancy secretly worked on a project to liberate Strafford from prison, the Puritan party pushed through an order for his execution on grounds of treason. The embattled king succumbed to parliamentary threats against his family and signed the execution order, a move that would haunt him with blood-guilt for the rest of his life. After Strafford's decap-

² Ibid., Dedication, 192.

³ D. Howarth, *Images*, 192–209.

⁴ M. Glendinning, *History*, 54; Rolf Loeber, *A Biographical Dictionary of Architects in Ireland, 1620–1720* (London: John Murray, 1981), 6.

itation before a crowd of a hundred thousand spectators, the radicals whipped up further blood-lust against Laud.

Turning Thornborough's type of "Pythagorically Palingenesis" against the royalists, they attacked Laud as a black magician who indulged in Papist rituals. In a bizarre pamphlet, *A Plot Lately Discovered for the Taking of the Tower by Necromancie, for the Deliverance of the Archbishop* (1641), the author claimed that an astrologer-mathematician in Southwark was murdered by Laudian Papists, after he revealed the Cabalistic conspiracy to authorities. Hinting at the clandestine efforts of the Knights of Fancy, the author claimed that "three or four squashing Cavaliers" of Papist leanings sought out the astrologer because he had earlier collaborated with Laud, a devotee of the occult arts. The Cavaliers asked him to utilize a spell to allow the archbishop's friends into the Tower, where masquers and other debauchees would entertain him before freeing him. When the astrologer betrayed the plotters, the Cavaliers bound themselves by oaths to destroy him and utilized their intelligence network to accomplish the deed. The author's portrayal of Laud as a caco-magician was reinforced by news of the archbishop's gift of many Hebrew, Cabalistic, and Lullist manuscripts to the Bodleian Library.⁵

When the Puritan writer John Milton joined the attack on Laud by publishing *Of Reformation Touching Church-Discipline in England* (1641), he condemned the archbishop's architectural agenda as reeking with Papist corruption:

Now I appeale to all wise men what an excessive wast of Treasury hath been . . . in the Idolatrous erection of Temples beautified exquisitely to out-vie the Papists, the costly and deare-bought scandals, and snares of Images . . . the Prelats revell like Belshazzar with their full carouses in Goblets, and vessels of gold snatcht from Gods Temple.⁶

Milton would later ridicule the whole Solomonic theme of Stuart kingship and its Cabalistic techniques.

As Parliament continued to tear down the edifice of Charles's personal government, he determined to shore up support in Scotland and thus sent William Murray to Edinburgh with orders to negotiate with the Covenanters. As noted earlier, Murray was probably a

⁵ Edward Bernard, *Catalogus Librorum Manuscritorum Angliae et Hiberniae* (Oxford: Sheldonian Theatre, 1697), I, 51-74.

⁶ D. Howarth, *Images*, 66.

Freemason who, like Traquair, utilized “the Mason Word among the nobility.”⁷ With the move of Henry Alexander, Third Earl of Stirling, to England, the king lost the services of that loyalist family to Scottish Masonry. Thus, in May 1641 he appointed Sir John Veitch as “general surveyor, master of works and king’s architect for life.”⁸ After meeting with Ancram in London, Veitch carried the earl’s letters to his son Lothian, who was appointed governor of Newcastle by the occupying Scottish army.⁹ Lothian defended himself in letters to his anguished father by affirming his loyalty to the king but greater loyalty to Scotland’s rights.

The Covenanters refused to recognize Veitch’s appointment as Scottish Master of Works, and they used Masonic bonds to insure loyalty to their cause. Serving in the Scottish army at Newcastle was John Mylne, son of the king’s master mason, who helped recruit new members to the fraternity.¹⁰ On 20 May in Newcastle, Mylne and other members of the lodge of Edinburgh admitted as fellow-crafts and masters two important military officers, Quartermaster-General Robert Moray and General Alexander Hamilton.¹¹ Moray was probably initiated earlier, as suggested by his previous use of his personal Mason’s Mark (a pentagram or Seal of Solomon). That he was the cousin and political collaborator of William Murray suggests a Masonic network underlying the secret negotiations between king and Covenanters. Hamilton chose as his Mason’s Mark a Pythagorean triangle, and he shared mystical-mathematical interests with Moray. Having served in the Swedish army, where he was a favorite of Gustavus Adolphus, Hamilton taught Swedish military tactics and technology to the Scottish forces, which were a significant factor in their early successes.

On 10 August, with the agreement of the Scottish Commissioners in London, Charles set out for Edinburgh in order to be present in the Scottish Parliament to pass the Act of Pacification which would end the war between the two kingdoms.¹² When he arrived in New-

⁷ From later evidence, Jane Clark argues that “Ham House reveals the undoubted masonic affiliations of the Dysarts [Murrays] and Lauderdales”; see her article, “Lord Burlington is Here,” in Toby Bernard and Jane Clark, eds., *Lord Burlington: Architecture, Art and Life* (London: Hambledon, 1995), 291.

⁸ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 73–75.

⁹ R. Kerr, *Correspondence*, I, xxi, lxi, 109.

¹⁰ R.S. Mylne, *Master Masons*, 135.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 167–69; H. Carr, *Minutes*, 118–19.

¹² P. Gregg, *Charles I*, 336–37.

castle, he was greeted enthusiastically by the English and Scottish troops. His concessions won over the moderate Covenanters, and Lothian wrote his father, "I am for all the ways of gentleness and moderation."¹³ Moray and Hamilton agreed with Lothian, and the three officers accompanied the king and Scottish army northward to Edinburgh. Charles granted Hamilton an annual pension and promoted him to "General of his Majesty's Artillery."¹⁴ He would subsequently utilize Lothian and Moray in sensitive, secret negotiations with France. As Charles participated happily in parliamentary and Presbyterian business, he believed that he regained the allegiance of a majority of Scots.

The governing Covenanters now acquiesced to the king's choice of Veitch as Master of Works, despite an unusual challenge by one body of masons. In a remonstrance presented to Parliament in the name of "the artificers of the kingdom," the masons argued that because Charles was an absentee king, he could not know the technical qualifications of candidates for the master's role. Probably concerned that Veitch was merely a political appointment, the masons stressed that a master should "be eminent for his skill in all mechanick artes, discretion, honestie, and painfulness," in order to breed skilled "artificers of all Arts Usefull in Architecture."¹⁵ The petitioners were perhaps inspired by John Mylne, who while serving as royal master mason was a staunch supporter of the Covenant. Mylne was currently working on the Tron Church in Edinburgh, which expressed Calvinist principles of austerity and nationalist principles of religious independence.¹⁶ As the most important masonic dynasty in Scotland, the talented and ambitious Mylnes would have been the natural spokesmen for "the artificers of the kingdom."

The petitioners made clear that the traditional office of General Warden was so important that he should be appointed only after being recommended "by the whole Wardens and Deacons of the masons, Wrights, and others chosen by them assembled for that purpose." Utilizing Vitruvian terms to emphasize the prestige of their profession, the craftsmen proudly asserted that the General Warden should be

¹³ R. Kerr, *Correspondence*, I, lxiii.

¹⁴ D. Lyon, *History*, 96.

¹⁵ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 73.

¹⁶ D. Howard, *Scottish Architecture*, 192-93, 216.

... sufficiently qualified in Mechanicks, all that belongs to Architecture, to Plott and contrive what is fittest for building and reparacion, what Bewtifull and Usefull and least chargeable. To judge of workmens abilities and workmanship, To invent and use varieties of workes and Engines, To direct every severall Artisan in his owne arte, and to manage his place to the honour of the king and kingdome and flourishing of Artes and Artificers within the same.

When the king returned to London on 24 November 1641, he received a warm welcome from the new mayor and citizens, who approved of his accomodation with the Scottish Presbyterians. However, Puritan suspicions about his "mysterious activities in Scotland," rumors of royalist assassination plots, and a Catholic rebellion in Ireland soon undercut the king's conciliatory strategy and empowered the radicals in Parliament.¹⁷ While Charles was in the north, the iconoclasts determined to terminate Laud's final phase in the reconstruction of St. Paul's. They encouraged the parishioners of St. Gregory's church, which had been pulled down because of its abutment to Paul's, to demand financial compensation directly from Inigo Jones. By December Jones was so frightened by their charges that he reportedly tried to flee the country.¹⁸ While the iconoclasts raged at the Papist agenda of the cathedral project, more and more craftsmen deserted their unfinished stonework. William Dugdale, a royalist antiquarian, became so worried that the Puritans meant to destroy all beautiful churches and religious ornamentation that he secretly made memorial drawings of the monuments in St. Paul's, Westminster Abbey, and other churches.¹⁹

John Denham worried that the Puritan attack upon architecture portended greater violence to come. Thus, in *Cooper's Hill* (1642), the poet addressed the nearly-finished tower of St. Paul's: "Now shalt thou stand though sword, or time, or fire,/Or zeal more fierce than they, thy fall conspire," for the cathedral will be "Preserv'd from ruine by the best of Kings."²⁰ He then described Windsor Castle, whose massive stones suggested stability and endurance, in contrast to the ruined Chertsey Abbey, whose desecrated walls expressed the

¹⁷ P. Gregg, *Charles I*, 340.

¹⁸ H. Colvin, *History*, IV, 153.

¹⁹ William Dugdale, *The History of St. Paul's Cathedral*, 2nd rev. ed. (London: George James, 1716), viii.

²⁰ John Denham, *The Poetical Works of John Denham*, 2nd ed., ed. Theodore Banks (1928; New Haven: Yale UP/Archon, 1969), 65.

religious "Zeal" of Henry VIII and his violent Reformation. The poet hoped that "no such storm/Fall on our times, where ruine must reform." Such sentiments led Denham to fight for the king and to later succeed Inigo Jones as royal Master of Works at the Restoration.

Though Denham's hope for religious pacification and architectural survival was steadily frustrated in 1642, the Solomonic dream of the Stuarts gained a surprising reinforcement from the Jewish community in Amsterdam. Because this little-known affair would later have important ramifications in Freemasonry, it is worth recounting in detail. Early in 1642 Charles decided that his wife should undertake a secret mission to Holland, in which she would be accompanied by Arundel, who had returned from escorting the queen mother to Cologne, and by Mennes, who had returned from his work as an intermediary between the king and Scots at Newcastle. Once again, there was a suggestive collaboration between associates of Freemasonry and Fancy in order to carry out a clandestine royalist mission.

In February Henrietta Maria and her daughter Mary set off for Holland, ostensibly to establish the princess with her new husband, Prince William of Orange. But the queen's private purpose was the pawning of the crown jewels in order to raise funds for her husband's future military campaign. The Parliament's military leader, Oliver Cromwell, learned of the plan and made clear that the queen had no authority to sell the jewels. When Henrietta Maria tried to sell her personal jewelry, she encountered reluctance from merchants at The Hague. Someone then suggested that the Jewish merchants in Amsterdam might be more cooperative. Like her mother Marie de Medici, Henrietta Maria had long been tolerant toward Jews and interested in Hebrew medicine and mysticism. Her childhood in Paris was spent in the company of Jewish and crypto-Jewish physicians and magicians, brought from Italy by her mother.²¹ She subsequently employed Antonio Maria de Verona, an Italian Jew who gained fame in Paris for his skill in "divination through the medium of the Cabbalah."²² It was perhaps Verona who influenced the Cabalistic themes of sacramental sexuality—on earth and in heaven—

²¹ Pierre Chevallier, *Louis XIII—Roi Cornélian* (Paris: Fayard, 1979), 135; Fernand Hayem, *Le Maréchal d'Ancre et Léonora Galigai* (Paris, 1910), 245–49, 306, 311–12.

²² Cecil Roth, "The Middle Period of Anglo-Jewish History," *TJHSE*, 19 (1955–59), 11.

expressed in Henrietta Maria's masque, *The Temple of Love* (1635).²³ She was so impressed by Verona's learning and skills that she asked the universities of Cambridge and Oxford to show him special favor when he visited.

Popkin suggests that Henrietta Maria hoped to visit Saul Levi Morteira, chief rabbi of Amsterdam, whom she had known when he served her mother in Paris, before he was driven out by an anti-Cabalistic political purge.²⁴ Now seeking favor from the Jewish community in Amsterdam, the Stuart queen determined to make a public display of her good will by visiting the Spanish-Portuguese synagogue. Accompanied by the Stadholder Frederick Henry, Prince William, and Princess Mary, the queen arrived at the synagogue, where she was welcomed by Rabbi Menasseh ben Israel, who praised her as the "worthy consort of the most august Charles King of Britain, France, and Ireland."²⁵ From her contact with Menasseh, Henrietta Maria was introduced to other members of the Jewish community.

Menasseh owned a printing shop, where he employed Jews and Christians, and he developed contacts with Christian scholars in Europe and millenarians in England. At this time, he was working with Rabbi Jacob Jehudah Leon and Adam Boreel on a new edition of the *Mishna*.²⁶ As noted earlier, Boreel had earlier joined David Ramsay in support of Ziegler, the Rosicrucian "king of Jerusalem," and he now devoted himself to Hebrew studies to further his private conversionist agenda. Rabbi Leon had recently moved to Amsterdam from Middelburg, where the publication of his *Colloquium Middelburgense* (1641) gained him a Christian readership. Raised as a Marrano in Spain, Leon resumed his Jewish identity in Flanders. Well versed in Christian as well as Jewish scriptural scholarship, he presented a dialogue between a Christian and Jew on various difficult passages in the Bible. Importantly, Leon disagreed with Villalpando's anachronistic interpretation of Solomon's Temple, which so over-spiritualized the edifice that it removed the building from actual Jewish history. Encouraged by Boreel, Leon designed and constructed an

²³ S. Orgel and R. Strong, *Inigo Jones*, II, 599–630.

²⁴ Private communication from Professor Richard Popkin.

²⁵ A. Lewis Shane, "Jacob Judah Leon of Amsterdam (1602–1675) and His Models of the Temple of Solomon and the Tabernacle," *AQC*, 96 (1983), 146–69.

²⁶ R. Popkin, "Hartlib," 121–23.

elaborate wooden model of the Temple, which was currently exhibited at his house in Amsterdam.

Shortly after her visit to the synagogue, Henrietta Maria and her party went to Leon's house to see the model. The rabbi welcomed the queen and explained the details of the Temple to her. In an accompanying handbook, Leon discussed the different historical contexts of Solomon's and subsequent Jewish Temples. While giving precise and practical information on architectural and archaeological history, he also affirmed that God was "the chief artificer and the principal architect," who revealed the design to Moses, who passed it on to Solomon, who functioned as the working architect. Leon gave a copy of the handbook to the queen, who "owned" (acknowledged) the correctness of his interpretations. The royal party encouraged Leon to produce another model of the Tabernacle, and the rabbi later claimed that Prince William promised to contribute to the expenses of building the new model and publication of an accompanying handbook.²⁷

Henrietta Maria was assisted in her Jewish fund-raising efforts by William Murray, and in January 1643 she was able to report their success to Charles I: "I am to certify your majesty, that the jewels of your crown are, for present receipts, engaged to some certain Jews of Amsterdam."²⁸ In this secretive transaction lay the seed of later Jewish-Scottish-Masonic cooperation for the Stuart cause. Unfortunately, it is unknown whether Leon was privy to this affair, but he continued to admire the Stuarts' respectful attitude towards the Jews. Moreover, he would eventually become aware of the conversionist agenda of Boreel and his "philo-Semitic" colleagues, which was intensified by the Antilian dreams of Dury, Hartlib, and their European network.

In 1636–38 Dury had visited Sweden, where he became a friend of the Czech reformer Jan Amos Comenius, a refugee from the Bohemian wars, whose advocacy of Rosicrucian-style pansophia complemented that of Antilia. In February 1641, after Comenius urged Hartlib and Dury to approach Charles I as a potential supporter,

²⁷ Herbert I. Bloom, *The Economic Activities of the Jews of Amsterdam in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Williamsport: Bayard, 1937), 208; A. Shane, "Leon," 153–54.

²⁸ Henrietta Maria, *Letters of Queen Henrietta Maria*, ed. Mary A.E. Green (London: Richard Bentley, 1857), 63, 89, 148, 159.

he travelled to England “ostensibly to have a direct hand in establishing the new order.”²⁹ In April 1642, despite Laud’s earlier suspicions about Dury, the king appointed him to serve at The Hague as chaplain to his niece Mary, daughter of the Winter Queen. Laud commanded Dury to “precisely observe the method of the Liturgy and sense of the articles received and practiced in the Church of England.”³⁰ However, before leaving England, Dury secretly deserted the cause of the imprisoned Laud and conspired with the militant Covenanters to anonymously expose an alleged Laudian-Papist plot.³¹ At The Hague he publicly fulfilled his royal charge, but he privately corresponded with the king’s opponents. While he worked to link up radicals in Scotland and England, he warned Hartlib to keep this secret as usual, “least it might be known to such as I desire not to smell it.”³²

Dury also maintained contact with his uncle Ramsay, who sympathized with the Presbyterians but was still loyal to the king. Probably influenced by Puritan charges about the Papist associations of the Art of Memory, Dury now determined to develop a Protestant form of the Art. He must have learned from Ramsay about Scottish Masonic uses of the visualization techniques, which he tried to transform into a “Method of Spiritual Meditation”:

For (to make somewhat a comparison) as a carpenter or Mason, his rule doth direct [MS. torn] to worke in a straight or perpendicular line, as his art requires, so doth a precept or meditation direct the mind to think [torn] that way, as the method doth require. For in the method of [. . .] to edification there is a Spiritual Art, which if we . . . can discover . . .³³

Though Dury left this confused treatise unfinished, he produced another Latin tract on “De Mnemonica Rhethorica,” in which he utilized Hebrew letters and numbers and described various precepts of “artificial Memory.” However, with royalist architecture and its builders under attack as Papist, he omitted the architectural visualizations of the Lullist-Masonic art and stressed abstract verbalizations.³⁴

²⁹ D. Dickson, *Tessera*, 167.

³⁰ G. Turnbull, *Hartlib, Dury, and Comenius*, 225–26.

³¹ A. Milton, “Unchanged Peacemaker,” 109–13.

³² Hartlib Papers, 12/9/20A. (Dury to Borthwick. The Hague, 16 September 1642).

³³ *Ibid.*, 26/4/1A.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 129/7/1A–16B.

Dury's access to the Masonic lore of his uncle Ramsay became relevant to his study of Rabbi Leon's model of the Temple. However, his subsequent promotion of Leon's work was also motivated by his need to defend his own integrity as an irenic peacemaker, for rumors circulated about Dury's chameleon-like changes of loyalty. Thus, on 18 September 1642 he vowed to reassure his longtime supporter Nicholas Culpepper, who worried about Dury's alleged hypocrisy, by writing a treatise on "how the Jews should be wrought upon to Christianity."³⁵ Dury then visited Leon's exhibit, and he later reported to Hartlib that Boreel's eight years of Hebrew study with Leon and promotion of the Temple model were motivated by secret conversionist aims—"to elaborate the fundamentals of Christianity, against Atheists and Jews."³⁶ These aims were not shared by Henrietta Maria, with whom Dury may have discussed the model (he noted that she would leave for England in early October).

For Dury, Hartlib, and their millenarian colleagues, the revolutionary developments in Britain portended the Jews' approaching conversion. To this end, he and Hartlib proposed the creation of a college for Jewish studies, among other pansophic projects suggested by Comenius. Like the radical German Protestants, Comenius linked Cabalism and Rosicrucianism to dreams of an anti-Papal crusade. In an anonymously published pamphlet entitled *Englands Thankfulness, or An Humble Remembrance presented to the Committee for Religion in the High Court of Parliament with Thanksgiving for that happy Pacification betweene the two Kingdomes* (1642), Dury and Hartlib revealed a "most subtile Plot of the Pope and his conclave against Protestancy," the "best and principal meanes of re-establishing the Palatin House," and the "Preparatives for the conversion of the Jews."³⁷ Dury hoped to employ Menasseh ben Israel, Christian Ravius of Berlin, and J.S. Rittangel of Königsberg as faculty. That Rittangel published an edition of the *Sepher Yetzirah* at Amsterdam in 1642 and was an erudite Christian Cabalist made him an appropriate choice for a college dealing with "Jewish mysteries."³⁸ However, the funds that Dury hoped to receive

³⁵ G. Turnbull, *Hartlib, Dury, and Comenius*, 227, 231, 257.

³⁶ Hartlib Papers, 3/3/32A (Dury to Hartlib, 31 August 1646).

³⁷ Richard Popkin, "The First College for Jewish Studies," *Revue des Études Juives*, 143 (1984), 351-64.

³⁸ Richard Popkin, "Some Aspects of Jewish-Christian Theological Interchange in Holland and England, 1640-1700," in J. Van den Berg, *Jewish-Christian Relations*, 3-32.

were diverted by Parliament to suppression of the Catholic rebellion in Ireland.

While Dury continued his work as royal chaplain, he kept his eye on developments in Rotterdam, where the Scottish company of merchants undertook the construction of a new Presbyterian church in 1642. As his own position at Mary's court became more precarious, he secretly hoped to gain an appointment to the church and he tried to cultivate support among the builders, who imported craftsmen and building stone from Scotland. Dury kept Ramsay informed about this project, and Ramsay in turn recommended various Scottish refugees from the Irish rebellion to his nephew in Holland. Thus, while Dury was studying Leon's model and reading the rabbi's treatises, he was also in contact with Scottish operative masons and a Rosicrucian Freemason.³⁹

In March 1642 Charles I left London for York, where he hoped to consolidate support among the great northern families. In July Inigo Jones managed to send a personal loan to the king, carried by his assistant John Webb.⁴⁰ In London all work stopped on St. Paul's, and in September Parliament seized all the properties and building materials of the dean and chapter. When Charles established his court at Oxford in October, Jones concealed a large cache of money in Scotland Yard and then disappeared from London. According to Webb, he secretly joined the king at Oxford, where he converted his cathedral building skills into fortification work. Just before Webb was expelled from his position, he made sketches of the fortifications being constructed in London for defense against the royalist army and sent them to Charles. By November the actions of Parliament so alarmed the king that he raised his standard at Nottingham and launched the Civil War. The war brought to a standstill all royal building projects, and his Masters of Works faced increasing danger. In Scotland Veitch lamented that most of the king's houses were ruinous, and he asked for a co-Master in the person of John Carmichael (royalist son of the Treasurer Depute) to help him through the turbulent time.⁴¹

³⁹ G. Turnbull, *Hartlib, Dury, and Comenius*, 232–36, 242, 346.

⁴⁰ H. Colvin, *History*, IV, 155.

⁴¹ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 74.

During the three and a half years when Charles lived in Oxford, the university city attracted an eclectic group of royalists, many of whom shared interests in Freemasonry, Rosicrucianism, and chivalric fraternity. While placing their architectural, mathematical, mechanical, and chemical skills at the service of the king's military effort, they also benefited from the morale-boosting of the mystical and moral elements in these pursuits. The poet Abraham Cowley, who was ejected from Cambridge and joined the king at Oxford, expressed his support for the Stuarts' Solomonic ideals with an epic poem on David, Solomon, and the building of temples. In the unfinished *Davideis*, Cowley expressed his royalist views and poetic aim in architectural terms:

Lo, this great work, a Temple to thy praise,
On polisht Pillars of strong Verse I raise!
A Temple, where if Thou vouchsafe to dwell,
It Solomons, and Herods shall excel.

.....
Next upon Isra'els throne does bravely sit
A comely Youth [Solomon] endow'd with wondrous wit.
Far from the parched Loine a royal Dame [Sheba],
To hear his tongue and boundless wisdom came,
She carried back in her triumphant womb
The glorious stock of thousand Kings to come,
Here brightest forms his pomp and wealth display,
Here they a Temples vast foundations lay,
A mighty work; and with the glories fill'd.
For God t'enhabit, and that King to build.
Some from the quarries hew out massy stone,
Some draw it up with cranes, some breathe and grone
In order o're the anvile...⁴²

It was probably during his Oxford residence that Cowley met Robert Moray, the Scottish Freemason, who was included in the king's entourage. Cowley would later undertake secret missions to Scotland, and he developed an admiration for Moray, Balcarres, and other Scottish royalists that was unusual among the English courtiers. He and Moray shared interests in Hebraic lore, techniques of secret communication, and experimental science. Like Moray, Cowley would later propose a royal society of sciences, an idea that possibly emerged

⁴² Abraham Cowley, *Poems*, ed. A.R. Waller (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1905), 243, 297.

during their Oxford days.⁴³ As the confidential agent of Cardinal Richelieu, Moray was aware of the French savant's "project for a great Pansophic college" and his hope to recruit Comenius to organize it.⁴⁴ Though Richelieu's death in December 1642 frustrated the plan, his vision of a Comenian-style college to be supported by the French king may have influenced the notions of Moray and Cowley.

Moray became privy to a Scottish mission on behalf of the Scots Guard in France, when the Scottish Privy Council sent Lothian and Alexander Lindsay, Second Earl of Balcarres, to Oxford to confer with Charles I about incursions on the ancient privileges of the Guard. On 10 January 1643 Charles wrote instructions for Lothian to appeal to the French king to restore the former privileges of the "Guarde de Corps" according to "the primitive institution thereof," to merge Captain Irwin's Scots Regiment into the Guard, to recognize that Scotsmen "are naturalized Frenchmen," and that "according to the former alliance betwixt the two Kingdomes, all Frenchmen shall have the same libertys and priviledges in our kingdome of Scotland as Scotsmen have."⁴⁵ Charles then knighted Moray, who joined Lothian on his journey to France, where Moray was appointed lieutenant-colonel in the Scots Guard. The Scottish agents may have been informed that Henrietta Maria was involved in a parallel effort to reinstate in Britain the "Knights of the Hospital of St. John in Jerusalem," a plan which included the return of their confiscated Commanderies.⁴⁶

While in Paris, Moray and Lothian called on Dr. William Davison, a native of Aberdeen, who was appointed physician to Louis XIII through the influence of Henrietta Maria. Leader of a group of Paracelsan lecturers at the *Jardin du Roi*, Davison espoused a peculiar blend of Scottish nationalism and Hermetic theosophy that would be of great interest to the Kerr family. On 6 May 1643 Lothian wrote his father, "Dr. Davison tells me he shall send some things to

⁴³ Arthur Nethercot, *Abraham Cowley* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1931).

⁴⁴ Harcourt Brown, *Scientific Organizations in Seventeenth Century France (1620-1680)* (Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins, 1934), 62.

⁴⁵ R. Kerr, *Correspondence*, I, 142-43.

⁴⁶ W.K.R. Bedford and Richard Holbeche, *The Order of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem* (London: F.E. Robinson, 1978), 103. The project was aborted when her agent Sir Nicholas Fortescue (initiated as the Knight of Justice in the Tongue of England) was killed in action in 1644.

your Lordship."⁴⁷ Moray was intrigued by Davison's chemical theories, and he was frequently invited to observe his experiments.⁴⁸ In the physican's publications one finds a repository of earlier Scottish Rosicrucianism, which was scientific, pacific, reformist, and still royalist. Moreover, he merged his Rosicrucian themes with Masonic allusions that suggest his participation in the emerging "speculative" and "illuminist" Masonic context among Stuart partisans.

When Davison earlier sought Richelieu's patronage, he was helped by Moray, who then served as the cardinal's confidential agent. In 1641 Davison dedicated to Richelieu a curious treatise entitled *Oblatio Salis* ("The Oblation of Salt, or France preserved by the Law of Salt"). While Moray labored to gain French support for the Covenanters, Davison provided Hermetic reinforcement by demonstrating the chemical origin of France's Salic Law and the chemical foundations of the ancient Franco-Scottish friendship. The treatise revealed the mystical interpretation that Davison gave to the "auld alliance" and to the permanent, incorruptible bond of the Covenant. According to Read,

The book sets out to "explain the nature of salt on the basis of obscure principles of pyrotechnic [alchemical] philosophy, also its secret meaning, showing how it was formerly used metaphorically of all contracts and agreements between God and His people, kings and princes and their subjects, and the civil society of mankind in general" . . . Quoting various references to salt in the Old Testament, he points out that "the Lord God of Israel gave the kingdom of Israel to David forever, even to him and his sons by a covenant of salt."⁴⁹

In 1641 Davison also published a new Latin edition and a French translation of his *Philosophia Pyrotechnia*, which targeted his growing international body of students. Dedicated to the Stuart-Lennox family, the book was greatly admired in Scotland. Filled with praise of the Stuart kings and heroic minds of his native country, Davison placed Scottish alchemy and mathematics clearly in the Rosicrucian tradition. While noting that adepts of the "Fratribus Roseae Crucis" were credited with liberating the soul from the body in a state of

⁴⁷ R. Kerr, *Correspondence*, I, 147.

⁴⁸ See *Philosophical Transactions of Royal Society*, IX, no. 108 (23 November 1674), 177.

⁴⁹ John Read, "William Davidson of Aberdeen, the First British Professor of Chemistry," *Ambix*, 11 (1963), 89. His name was usually spelled Davison or Davisson.

ecstasy, he pointed out the roots of their theosophy in Hermetic and Jewish lore.⁵⁰ He included learned discussions of the *Zohar* and other Cabalistic works, as well as explications and diagrams of Lull's Cabalistic mnemonic-mathematic techniques. Moray would later recommend Davison's book to a fellow virtuoso in England.⁵¹

Through his contacts with Moray, Lothian, and Ancram, Davison's Cabalistic-Pythagorean descriptions of the divine sources of architecture possibly contributed to the "illumination" of Scottish Masonic lore. To accompany an engraving that depicted a flower and bee enclosed in hexagrams, Davison merged chemical-Rosicrucian theory with mathematical-Masonic notions. As Read observes,

The first of two inscriptions on this plate states that "as a solid angle cannot be made without three planes, so a natural body cannot be made without salt, sulphur, and mercury." The second is a quotation from the Wisdom of Solomon: "Thou hast ordered all things in measure and number and weight." This dictum summarizes Davison's views, which are based upon the Pythagorean and Platonic conceptions of the importance of number, geometrical form, and harmonies in the interpretation of Nature and the Cosmos.⁵²

The engraving evokes echoes of the emblematic bee and rose on the Rosicrucian treatise by Frizius, the Scottish friend of Robert Fludd.

Davison also drew on descriptions in the *Zohar* about the construction of the Tabernacle and Temple. He noted that the "architecte de lumières" infused his divine spirit into every detail.⁵³ He then described the steps necessary to "image" or visualize the sacred architecture—"tout de meme que la pensée d'un Architecte qui voulant bastir une Ville ou maison, conçoit en sa pensée un modèle, idée, ou exemple de la ville ou maison qu'il a dessein de faire." In future works, Davison would elaborate on his Masonic themes, and it is possible that he was associated with the lodge allegedly established at St. Germain-en-Laye by Stuart partisans. His friend Lothian took advantage of his residence in Paris to purchase books on alchemy and architecture, including volumes of Vitruvius and

⁵⁰ William Davison, *Philosophia Pyrotechnia* (Paris: J. Bessin, 1641), part I, 18–38, 70.

⁵¹ *Philosophical Transactions*, IX, no. 108, p. 177.

⁵² J. Read, *Humour and Humanism*, 91.

⁵³ Material from his lectures; quoted in William Davison, *Les Elements de la Philosophie de l'Art du Feu ou Chemie*, trans. Jean Hellot (Paris: F. Piot, 1651), 146, 227.

practical manuals on domestic and military construction.⁵⁴ On Lothian's return to Scotland, he had his masons construct an elaborate sundial replete with Hermetic imagery.⁵⁵

In March 1643 Henrietta Maria travelled to York, where she used William Murray in negotiations with the Covenanters and welcomed many Scottish visitors.⁵⁶ These actions so enraged the iconoclasts that they sacked her chapel at Somerset House. In London the systematic desecration of the Stuarts' beloved Solomonic architecture was undertaken in God's name. In Edinburgh Carmichael realized the hopelessness of his effort as co-Master of Works, and he joined the king's army in Oxford. In September the parliamentary army in England took the Solemn League and Covenant, an oath-bound commitment to anti-Catholicism and sectarian intolerance that went far beyond the terms of the original Covenant, which had earlier drawn moderate as well as radical support in Scotland. When Lothian returned to London on 27 September, his continued loyalty to the Covenanters provoked accusations of treachery, and the king ordered his imprisonment.⁵⁷ While his Scottish friends lobbied Charles for his release, Lothian compounded his problems by signing the Solemn League and Covenant in October.

The news from Scotland was troubling to Moray, who was currently on campaign with the French army. According to Boisivon, the French envoy in Edinburgh, Charles I's party was now much larger than that of the radical Covenanters, who were alienating many citizens. Most alarming, however, was the radicals' determination to carry their holy war onto the Continent. General Leslie demanded thirty thousand troops before he would march into England, asserting that "he wishes to be in a position to lay down the law to all Europe."⁵⁸ Moray had gained the confidence of Richelieu's successor, Cardinal Mazarin, to whom he sent reports about British developments. However, the militance of the leading Covenanters now made Moray's conciliatory advice irrelevant. Because the increasingly violent religious intolerance provides a background for the

⁵⁴ R. Kerr, *Correspondence*, II, Appendix, 525, 540.

⁵⁵ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, plate 2b.

⁵⁶ Henrietta Maria, *Letters*, 186, 217.

⁵⁷ R. Kerr, *Correspondence*, I, lxxv, lxxi.

⁵⁸ J.G. Fotheringham, ed., *The Diplomatic Correspondence of Jean de Montreuil and the Brothers de Bellière, French Ambassadors in England and Scotland, 1645-48* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1899), II, 554-56.

development of increasingly pragmatic tolerance among royalist Freemasons, Boisvion's report to Mazarin in Paris is illuminating:

The Covenant of England and Scotland is a league made between the English Parliament and Scottish Council by which they oblige themselves generally and individually to exterminate all Papists without respect of person. The Scottish churches and the Council send into Germany and into Holland to have the Covenant signed, or at least to invite people to join their league. The Scottish churches and the Council have decided that no Catholic will be able to serve in France . . . The Irvine regiment has lately been named Regiment of Guards. It remains to be seen how far in view of these two articles one may trust the person of his Majesty into the hands of these gentlemen.⁵⁹

This threat to the ancient institution of the Scots Guard was compounded by General Leslie's ambition to destroy European Catholicism. Vowing to imitate his former commander Gustavus Adolphus, "who with a smaller force than they possess overran all Germany," Leslie exhorted the army:

Consider . . . what a glorious thing it would be before God and man, if we manage to drive the Catholics out of England and follow them to France, and . . . unite with those of our religion there, and plant *nolens volens* our religion in Paris and thence go to Rome, drive out Antichrist and burn the town that disseminates superstition.

Moray and the moderate Covenanters did not share Leslie's sectarian militancy but, from their posts in Europe, they were unable to exert a moderating influence on their former colleagues in Scotland. In November 1643, when the French were defeated by the Imperial army, Moray was taken prisoner to Ingolstadt in Bavaria.

In January 1644 Leslie led the Scottish army into England, an invasion that provoked the royalist poet John Cleveland—member of the king's entourage at Oxford—to express his horror at the Jewish pretensions of the radical Covenanters. In "The Rebell Scot," Cleveland lambasted the Scots in terms that later assumed Masonic significance. Earlier at Oxford he had met certain royalist Scots whom he did admire—perhaps Moray, Balcarres, Dunfermline, or Lauderdale. Despite the general Scotophobia expressed in the poem, Cleveland conceded that there were a few admirable defenders of monarchy and Episcopalianism in the northern kingdom:

⁵⁹ Ibid., II, 555–56.

Nature her selfe doth Scotch-men beasts confesse,
 Making their Countrey such a wilderness:
 A Land that brings in question and suspense
 Gods omnipresence, but that CHARLES came thence:
 But that *Montrose* and *Crawfords* loyall Band
 Atton'd their sins, and christn'ed halfe the Land.
 Nor is it all the Nation hath these spots;
 There is a Church, as well as *Kirk* of Scots:

.....
 A Land where one may pray with curst intent,
 O may they [Scots] never suffer banishment!
 Had *Cain* been *Scot*, God would have chang'd his doome,
 Not forc'd him to wander, but confin'd him home.
 Like Jewes they spread, and as Infection flie,
 As if the Divell had Ubiquitie.
 Hence 'tis, they live as Rovers; and die
 This or that Place, Rags of Geographie.
 They're Citizens o'the World; they're all in all,
 Scotland's a Nation Epidemicall.

.....
 No; the *Scots-Errant* fight, and fight to eat;
 Their Estrich-stomacks make their swords their meat:

.....
 Was it for this you left your leaner soyle,
 Thus to lard Israel with Aegypts spoyle?
 They are the Gospels Life-guard; but for them,
 The Garrison of new Jerusalem,
 What would the Brethren do?⁶⁰

Though Cleveland's characterisation of the Scots as dispersed Jews, citizens of the world, knights errant, Hebraic antagonists of Egypt, and defenders of Jerusalem was meant to insult them, eighteenth-century Jacobite Masons would proudly claim these qualities as their Scottish heritage. In a later poem, Cleveland suggested his awareness of the role that Freemasonry played in Scottish political life.⁶¹

In spring 1644 the trial of Archbishop Laud began, which gave the iconoclasts an opportunity to vent their hostility to all architecture and ornamentation that expressed the "Beauty of Holiness." Most of the charges against Laud were managed by William Prynne, who

⁶⁰ John Cleveland, *The Poems of John Cleveland*, eds. Brian Morris and Eleanor Withington (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967), 30–31.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 46–47. "The Hue and Cry After Sir John Presbyter" (ca. December 1646), to be discussed later.

had earlier attacked the royal masques. In March the Commons commissioned Prynne to collect evidence against the archbishop's Papist proclivities. After examining Laud's confiscated papers, Prynne published *Canterburies Doom* to prove that Laud was a proponent of Catholic image-worship. In this remarkable manifesto of *Unkultur*, Prynne rejoiced over the re-destruction of the stained glass windows at Lambeth chapel, which Laud had dared to repair in 1634. Though the "Romish fox," with his "hot Popish scent," attempted to stop the pillaging, the mob was able to destroy windows depicting Solomon on his throne, Sheba coming to Solomon, and David's coronation.⁶² Prynne quoted a Puritan sermon that condemned Solomon and all kings of Israel, the wise men of Egypt, the Indian gymnosophists, and Greek and Roman philosophers—in other words, the whole *prisca theologia* that infused the Stuarts' Renaissance world-view.

Prynne then attacked the craftsmen who worked on architectural projects. After mocking the prayer read by Laud while he participated in the masonic ceremony of laying the first stone of a new building, Prynne recorded the names of masons, painters, carpenters, and glazers that he found in the archbishop's financial accounts. He especially targeted Adam Browne, a joiner who rose to become Surveyor of Westminster Abbey in 1639. Laud frequently employed Browne, who handled negotiations with the masons at St. John's College. Colvin notes that the drawings Browne presented to Laud should make the former joiner "rank as one of the leading English architectural designers of the 1630s."⁶³ Prynne boasted that the arrest and interrogation of Browne would frighten those clergy and laity who "imitated his example in repairing or new erecting in their Churches, Chappells, Colledges, Houses" to the "infinite scandall of all sincere Protestants." When Laud defended his use of artistic images and architectural embellishment by citing precedents in Jewish, Biblical, and Calvinist traditions, Prynne replied that the practice proceeded from "a rotten Idolatrous Romish heart, and Traiterous endeavour." When the seventy-two year-old archbishop was beheaded in January 1645, he became in effect a Masonic martyr.

During his trial, Laud cited his support of Dury's irenic work as evidence of his non-Papist policies. However, some Puritan friends

⁶² William Prynne, *Canterburies Doome* (London: John Macock, 1646), 58–71.

⁶³ H. Colvin, *Biog. Dict.*, 170.

of Dury replied that the Scottish minister often complained about Laud's insufficient backing.⁶⁴ In March 1644 Dury applied to the Prince of Orange for a pass to England, which provoked conflicting Puritan reports that Dury would "by the King's appointment betray and undermine the counsels of the Parliament and Assembly and and that he . . . considers Parliament to be in rebellion." The prince asked Dury to declare for Charles I or Parliament and warned that he would not send him if he did not support the king. In May Dury resigned his royal position and took up the post of minister to the Presbyterian church in Rotterdam, where his tenure was difficult because of many members' opposition to his attempts to implement the new Covenant and Parliament's latest "reforms" of ceremony.

During this period, Dury and Hartlib still hoped for financial assistance from Ramsay, who continued in the employment of Charles I. It seems likely that Ramsay was kept in the dark about their radical activities, for he gave Hartlib a copy of his "Propositions concerning Mines, etc.," which described his grant from the king and royalist nobles in Scotland to "search, digg, and worke all mynes Royall," which "will be to the great honor and profit to the Crowne of England, especially in these troublesome times."⁶⁵ Over the next years, Dury and Hartlib continued to dream of exploiting Ramsay's favor with the king (who promised royal soldiers to protect his mining efforts), in order to fund their millenarian projects.⁶⁶ Ramsay's patriotic enthusiasms about Scotland's potential riches (to be developed by the "masonic" skills of mathematics, surveying, mechanics, metallurgy, and mining) inspired Dury to hope for accompanying Hermetic breakthroughs. Thus, Dury planned to send German alchemists to Scotland to implement J.B. van Helmont's program, which corresponded with those of Bacon, Comenius, and Cozok, and will "worke upon the Papists, better than many books of learned Divines."⁶⁷

At the same time, Dury continued to study the writings of Menasseh ben Israel and Jacob Jehudah Leon and to hope that the current religious turbulence would usher in the conversion of the Jews. In January 1645 Hartlib received a grant from Parliament, and he

⁶⁴ G. Turnbull, *Hartlib, Dury, and Comenius*, 235–45.

⁶⁵ Hartlib Papers, 63/4/3A. Dury expected the Scottish Parliament to approve by next June 1644.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 1/2/1A–2A, 12A.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 45/1/23A. Apellius to Hartlib (Leipzig? 5 February 1646).

promised to direct his efforts to “the most remotest Parts from Christendome” to ensure that “our Elder Brethren (I meane the Jews)” are “taken into serious considerations and overtures.”⁶⁸ He and Dury believed that Latin translations of the *Talmud* and *Mishna* would help “the common sort of Jews” to understand the constitutions of their religion and thus, paradoxically, be persuaded of the superiority of the New Testament.⁶⁹ Dury and Hartlib hoped to purchase Leon’s model of the Temple and bring it to England.⁷⁰ However, their conversionist agenda would not have pleased Leon, who was a staunch defender of his Jewish heritage. As we shall see, Leon’s later association with Stuart Freemasonry would not require his conversion.

As Dury secretly utilized his Judaic studies and Masonic contacts in the service of the radical Protestants in Parliament, Robert Moray, John Evelyn, and Thomas Henshaw pursued their Solomonic interests among Catholic scholars on the Continent. The three royalists reached beyond the anti-Papist paranoia of their homeland to benefit from the encyclopedic scholarship and theosophic illumination of the great Jesuit polymath, Athanasius Kircher. In the process, they developed an ecumenical sense of natural and supernatural science that would have a significant influence on Freemasonry and the Royal Society of Science.

While held as a prisoner of war in Ingolstadt from November 1643 until April 1645, Moray was allowed to pursue his studies in natural magic and experimental science. Earlier, when he served with the Covenanters’ army, he had discussed with Alexander Hamilton the mathematical theories published by Marcus Marci of Kronland in *De Linea Ephigmica* (Prague, 1636). In a later letter to Alexander Bruce, a fellow Mason, he praised it as “a noble book teaching the Science of Motion after the manner of Euclid.”⁷¹ Marci also wrote on Cabalistic cryptography and the pantheistic world-soul, and he attempted to confirm his mystical beliefs by the “newly established

⁶⁸ D. Katz, *Philo-Semitism*, 217–18.

⁶⁹ G. Turnbull, *Hartlib, Dury, and Comenius*, 257–58.

⁷⁰ Hartlib Papers, 53/37/1A (Hartlib? n.d.).

⁷¹ National Library of Scotland: Transcript of Kincardine Papers. Letters of Sir Robert Moray to Alexander Bruce, Earl of Kincardine (April 1658). Henceforward cited as Kincardine MSS.

tenets of natural science."⁷² In 1639 the Catholic Marci visited Kircher in Rome, and the two became close friends and correspondents.

Already interested in Marci's scientific mysticism, Moray was delighted when a friendly Jesuit gave him a copy of Kircher's work on magnetism, which inspired Moray to initiate a correspondence with the author.⁷³ Godwin notes that mathematics and science were important components in the education of Jesuit missionaries because technology was useful in impressing the heathen; the missionaries, in turn, sent back reports from every corner of the globe:

Kircher was at the center of the network. He was the first to hear of any new discovery and was always eager to share it with the world . . . Kircher was committed to the free exchange of information, irrespective of nationality or religion.⁷⁴

This ecumenical global outreach in the name of scientific exchange would have an important influence on Moray's own plans for the Royal Society in 1660.

In the first works that Moray studied, *Ars Magnesia* (1631) and *Magnes* (1641), Kircher revealed his wide reading in occultist authors (including Roger Bacon, Lull, Dee, Drebbel, and Fludd), whose theories he tested by practical experiment.⁷⁵ While describing God as the great magnet that holds the universe together, he discussed the ramifications of universal magnetism into hydromancy, telepathy, perpetual motion, and other subjects of concern to natural magicians. Moray was especially interested in Kircher's belief that secret messages could be sent over a distance by using magnets. The transmitter would thus avoid the "detestable superstitions" involved in necromantic telepathy—such as sending out sympathetic rays from the mind, using talismans under certain constellations, or employing adjurations and blood. Moray, who became an expert at secret communication, continued to study Kircher's works on Egyptian hieroglyphics, Cabalistic codes, and Hermetic correspondences over the

⁷² Lubos Novy, "Johannes Marcus Marci of Kronland," C. Gillespie, *Dictionary*, IX, 96–98.

⁷³ John Fletcher, ed., *Athanasius Kircher und seine Beziehungen zum gelehrten Europa seiner Zeit* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1988), 139–64.

⁷⁴ Joscelyn Godwin, "Athanasius Kircher," in James Hardin, ed., *Dictionary of Literary Biography*, Vol. 164: *German Baroque Writers, 1580–1660* (Detroit: Gale Research, 1996), 185–94.

⁷⁵ William Hine, "Athanasius Kircher and Magnetism," in J. Fletcher, *Kircher*, 79–98.

next decades. He would long be grateful to the Jesuit scholar for helping to gain his release from prison in 1645.

While Moray was corresponding with Kircher, the English virtuosos John Evelyn and Thomas Henshaw visited the Jesuit polymath in Rome in November 1644.⁷⁶ Both men fought for Charles I and subsequently had to leave England. Henshaw participated in a campaign for the Prince of Orange and then travelled in France and Spain. He and Evelyn shared interests in architecture, mathematics, chemistry, and alchemy.⁷⁷ Kircher may have informed Henshaw and Evelyn about his correspondence with Moray, for the two later became close friends of the Scottish Mason. Like Moray, Henshaw rejected sectarian intolerance, and he would later organize a secret Rosicrucian-style “college” in London, which included Moray’s protégé Thomas Vaughan and several Catholics.

During Evelyn’s military service for the king, he studied and inspected fortifications in England. In 1641 and 1644–45 he travelled in Europe, where he made further investigations of architecture, alchemy, and Jewish lore—studies that provoked his interest in operative masonry. At Calais he admired the strong stone architecture and fortifications constructed by an earlier English occupying force, and he recorded his pleasure at reading the carved inscription “God save the King, in English, together with the name of the architect.”⁷⁸ At St. Denis he inspected the tomb of Charles Martel, the traditional patron of the craft. At Rome Evelyn praised not only classical edifices but the “noble architecture” of the Jesuits’ church. He attended a lecture on Euclid by Kircher, who discussed hieroglyphic theories with him. Evelyn subsequently sent Kircher his sketch of a hieroglyphic stone, which the Jesuit included in *Obeliscus Pamphilius* (1650), a work of great interest to Moray and his Masonic friends.

As an erudite Hebraist, Kircher encouraged Evelyn in his Hebrew studies, which the latter undertook through unusual contacts with Jews during his travels. In Amsterdam, Leiden, and Avignon, Evelyn visited synagogues and discussed messianic and Cabalistic notions with Jewish friends.⁷⁹ In Rome he was invited by a Jewish acquaint-

⁷⁶ Stephen Pasmore, “Thomas Henshaw, FRS (1618–1700),” *Notes and Records of the Royal Society*, 36 (1982), 177–80.

⁷⁷ D. Dickson, *Tessera*, 186–90, 211–12.

⁷⁸ See J. Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, II, 83, 230–31, 270, 283; III, 171–72.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, II, 42, 54–55.

tance to attend a circumcision ceremony in a synagogue in the ghetto. He also listened to a Catholic priest deliver a conversionist sermon to the Hebrew community, but he thought it ineffective and noted that conversions were very rare. In Venice, after he listened to another sermon to the Jews, he was asked to stand godfather to a converted Jew and Turk. However, Evelyn did not seem interested in converting the Jews, whom he respected as Jews. Unfortunately, he was frustrated in his attempt to travel to Jerusalem to further his studies in Hebraic lore.

Most relevant to his Masonic interests was his study of the great Roman coliseum, which he believed was constructed by thirty thousand Jewish masons. Evelyn accepted the argument of P. Totti, in *Ritratto de Roman antica* (1638), that Jewish prisoners provided the technological expertise and labor on the project.⁸⁰ The coliseum was finished by the Emperor Titus, who after destroying the Second Temple, brought the captured Jewish masons to Rome. Employing the skills learned in Jerusalem for the cutting and placement of Tiburtine stone, they built the coliseum to "a vast height, with the five orders of architecture." Evelyn also studied the Triumphal Arch erected in honor of Titus's victory in Jerusalem which featured carved representations of the Ark of the Covenant, the Menorah, the Tables of the Law, and other sacred vessels. Believing these to represent authentic Jewish artifacts, Evelyn commissioned an artist to copy the frieze, "for the light it gave to the Holy History." He observed that St. Peter's was only surpassed by Solomon's Temple, and he took notes on the twisted columns brought from that Temple.

Kircher, Evelyn, Henshaw, and Moray were also interested in alchemical writings, which they explored in order to find genuine chemical and metallurgical processes that could be verified by experiment. In Paris Evelyn inspected St. Innocent's church, which featured the emblematic sculptures of Nicholas Flamel and his wife Pernella, who reportedly used their alchemical gold to found the church and other charitable establishments.⁸¹ He spent much time studying the hieroglyphical characters of Flamel's "philosophical work," which would later fascinate Hermetic Freemasons. Evelyn also visited the *Jardin du Roi*, and he praised the botanical collections, chemical laboratory, and other buildings. He learned that Dr. William

⁸⁰ Ibid., II, 249 n.7, 255, 261.

⁸¹ Ibid., II, 131-32.

Davison was giving his acclaimed lectures on chemistry and alchemy at the *Jardin*, and on his return to Paris in 1649, he attended the course and praised Davison, "Prefect of that excellent garden."

After Moray's release in April 1645, he visited Paris, where he resumed his political efforts for the Stuart cause. He also continued his observations of architectural technology, and he possibly had some influence on French masonry, for in that year the French adopted the Scottish custom of naming a "General Warden of the Masons."⁸² In July the French foreign minister Mazarin sent Jean de Montereul to London with secret instructions to work out a new alliance between Charles I and Scotland.⁸³ By autumn Moray was also in London, where he mediated the negotiations between the Scottish commissioners, the king, and French envoy. The work was carried out in extreme secrecy, with loyalist oaths extracted from participants and nearly all instructions given orally. The king even gave Montereul his own recipe for invisible ink.⁸⁴ However, the royalists were shocked when Parliament published *The King's Cabinet Opened* (1645), based on the confiscated correspondence of Charles and Henrietta Maria, in which he promised her news "concerning Military as Cabalistical matters."⁸⁵ It is unclear whether Charles referred to their coding techniques or to her secret transactions with the Jews in Amsterdam, but the "Cabalistic" charge would reverberate in parliamentary propaganda.

In October, when Moray was appointed commander of the Scots Guard, he added the clandestine recruitment of troops for French service to his continuing negotiation work between the French and British kings. In both these enterprises, he relied upon a network of men who were definitely or probably Freemasons—Traquair, Lauderdale, Murray, St. Clair, Dunfermline, Balcarres, etc.—to both defend Presbyterianism in Scotland and to support the king against English threats. The Scottish Masons may have hoped to link up with English brethren, such as Inigo Jones and his party of royalist craftsmen. Though the king's master mason Nicholas Stone was ill (he died in

⁸² A. Lawrie, *History*, 110.

⁸³ For Moray's role in important, secret negotiations, see J. Montereul, *Diplomatic Correspondence*, passim.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, I, xxv.

⁸⁵ *The King's Cabinet Opened* (London: Robert Botstock, 1645), 15.

1647), his son John fought for the king and was currently a fugitive from the parliamentary forces.⁸⁶

While living concealed in London, John Stone anonymously published *Enchiridion of Fortification, or a Handfull of Knowledge in Martiall Affairs* (1645), which was targeted at artisans and soldiers who supported the king. In a dedication to the unnamed author, "H.S." affirmed, "Could I erect huge Pyramids of stone/I would divulge thy praise and name thereon." John Stone addressed the craftsmen as "the Quintessence of Chivalry," and he emphasized that man is the image of God, especially in the creative and intellectual spirit that makes possible architectural and fortification work.⁸⁷ Utilizing the engraved image of the compass, Stone gave practical instructions in the use of the masonic implements of compass, square, ruler, etc., as well the mathematics and geometry of military architecture and gunnery. He compressed his treatise into a tiny book that could be hidden in the mason's pocket.

Unfortunately, on 14 October 1645, the Stones' mentor Inigo Jones was captured by Cromwell. The once-proud Master of Works was publicly humiliated when one of the troopers stripped him of his clothing and ordered that he be carried away in a blanket. Puritan pamphlets rejoiced at the plight of "the famous Surveyor and enemy of St. Grigory," who had contrived "Scenes for the Queen's Dancing Barn."⁸⁸ In March 1646, after vandals damaged his house while searching for his hidden treasure, a desperate Jones appealed to Parliament, claiming that he had not taken up arms and that he was willing to take the Covenant and Negative Oath. He submitted a list of his assets, which included "Goods and instruments mathematicall and other things of that Nature belonging to my profession," but he hoped to keep "certain Modellls and other like commodities which I only used and keepe for my pleasure, but of noe profit." No mention was made of the hidden treasure, and he paid half of the hefty fine. After receiving a pardon in June, Jones and his deputy Webb lived quietly in Scotland Yard, still hoping that they would finish Whitehall Palace which, as Colvin notes, "had been building, in the clouds, for nearly a decade."

With the Masquing House now demolished and St. Paul's full of

⁸⁶ H. Colvin, *Biog. Dict.*, 929.

⁸⁷ [Nicholas Stone], *Enchiridion of Fortification* (London, 1645), Preface, 1, 5, 9, 54.

⁸⁸ H. Colvin, *History*, IV, 156–58.

troops, the mystical claim of architecture and masque to heal the kingdom was in ruins. However, in Italy the royalists Arundel, Waller, Evelyn, and Henshaw continued to shore fragments against these masonic ruins, while they examined the construction work on the unfinished Milan cathedral, whose great architect Borromini utilized the training he gained as an apprenticed stonemason to continue the complex Gothic design and intricate stone carving.⁸⁹ Evelyn was joined by Sir Robert Bruce, Earl of Elgin, who shared his interest in architecture and whose family had traditional associations with Scottish Freemasonry. Though the now impoverished Arundel died in September 1646, Evelyn and Waller continued to utilize their own "Masonic" skills to aid the Stuart cause at home and abroad. Both men acted as intelligencers and couriers between Stuart supporters in France and England.

In the face of Cromwell's victories, Moray used the cover of his promotion in the Scots Guard in order to return to Paris, where he consulted with Henrietta Maria about the demands the Scots were making on her husband. He soon gained the confidence of the queen, who would use him as her personal agent in "treating with Scotland."⁹⁰ Serving with the Stuart court at St. Germain-en-Laye was Abraham Cowley, Moray's former colleague at Oxford, who was responsible for all secret correspondence between the queen and king. Cowley became an expert at Cabalistic techniques of using numbers for letters and words, and he subsequently handled Moray's coded correspondence between France and Britain. Like Moray, Cowley maintained "unsuspected secrecy," while he "managed a vast intelligence in many other parts."⁹¹ Given the two men's similar interests in Solomonic architecture and science and, later, their mutual Masonic friends, it is tempting to think that Cowley became associated with Freemasonry during one of his secret missions to Scotland.⁹² Anderson would later claim that the queen's secretary Sir Henry Jermyn, who employed Cowley, became a Grand Master of English Masonry.⁹³

⁸⁹ J. Evelyn, *Diary*, II, 449, 493; III, 166, and Rudolph Wittkower, *Gothic Versus Classic: Architectural Projects in Seventeenth-Century Italy* (New York: Braziller, 1974), 18-27.

⁹⁰ F.J. Routledge, ed., *Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers Preserved in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1932), I, 290.

⁹¹ A. Nethercot, *Cowley*, 113-15.

⁹² For Cowley's devotion to the Balcarres family, see Chapter 9.

⁹³ J. Anderson, *Constitutions* (1738), 101. Jermyn allegedly served as Grand Master of the restored lodges in 1660.

In the meantime, Henrietta Maria was persuaded by Moray and Mazarin that Charles should take the Covenant, an act that would ensure the loyalty of the Scots and the English Presbyterians to his cause. Though Charles was willing to grant religious freedom to Ireland and to sanction the Covenant in Britain, he refused to compromise his personal religious beliefs or to force others to acquiesce to the Presbyterians and Independents. In January 1646, when Montereul pressured him to sign the Covenant, the king replied that "his conscience would not allow him to consent to the ruin of the religion he had sworn to maintain, and that he would rather lose his crown than his soul."⁹⁴ However, with hostilities growing between the Scots and English, Charles agreed with Montereul and Moray to leave Oxford and join the Scottish army at Newark. In March Moray wrote to Montereul with a promise from the Scottish commissioners that the king would be maintained with "perfect safety" by the Scots, "provided that he consent" to the Uxbridge proposals and that he "sign the Covenant either before going to the army or on arriving there, as he chooses." Unfortunately, for Moray and the king, Montereul either deceived them or was deceived by Charles, who had no intention of signing the detested Covenant.

One royalist who suspected the Scots of treachery was the poet John Cleveland, who had recently left Oxford to serve as Judge Advocate for the royalist garrison at Newark. In "The King's Disguise," Cleveland lamented the humiliating, vile costume worn by Charles during his escape from Oxford in April, which rendered him equivalent to the desecrated architecture of the time:

His muffled fabrick speakes him a recluse,
His ruines prove it a religious house.
.....
Heaven, which the Minister of thy Person owns,
Will fine thee for Dilapidations.
Like to a martyr'd Abbeyes courser doome,
Devoutly alter'd to a Pigeon roome;
Or like the colledge by the changeling rabble,
Manchesters Elves, transform'd into a Stable.⁹⁵

⁹⁴ F. Routledge, *Calendar . . . Clarendon*, I, 104, 163–64.

⁹⁵ John Cleveland, *The Poems of John Cleveland*, eds. Brian Morris and Eleanor Withington (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967), 6–9. "Manchester's elves" referred to parliamentary troops.

At Newark, when the imperious General Leslie treated the king and Cleveland disrespectfully, the poet retaliated with a satire that revealed his disdainful familiarity with the Scots' current motives and methods. In "The Hue and Cry After Sir John Presbyter," Cleveland suggested not only Jewish but Masonic pretensions among the Covenanting troops:

The Negative and Covenanting Oath,
Like two Mustachoes issuing from his mouth;
.....
The Presbyter, though charm'd against mischance
With the Divine right of an Ordinance:
 If you meet any that doe thus attire'em,
 Stope them, they are the tribe of Adoniram.
.....
 What mean the Elders else, those Kirk Dragoons,
 Made up of Ears and Ruffs, like Duckatoons?
 That Hierarchie of Handicrafts begun?
 These new Exchange-men of Religion?⁹⁶

As Sir John the Presbyter joins with "Jack of all trades," Cleveland seemed to hint at the linkage between the Covenanters and the Masons. Thus, the tribe of Hiram, master mason of Solomon's Temple, utilizes a hierarchical craft fraternity in order to join the money-changers in the Herodian Temple.

The king was so distressed by the rude treatment he received at Newark that he summoned Moray to travel from London to help in his negotiations. But before Moray arrived, General Leslie contemptuously dismissed Cleveland and carried Charles as prisoner when he led the Scots army on to Newcastle. When Moray reached the latter city in May, he urged his countrymen to treat the king more respectfully, and he urged Charles to accept the Scots' conditions. His efforts evidently impressed Lothian, who had been pardoned by Charles in March 1644 after intercession by William Murray, and who joined the king's party within the Scottish army.⁹⁷ However, Moray's pleas to Leslie and Charles were fruitless, and the sad result meant that Cleveland could well have lumped royalist Masons like Moray, Balcarres, Lothian, Traquair, Alexander Hamilton,

⁹⁶ Ibid., 45–47.

⁹⁷ On Lothian's collaboration with Balcarres and Moray in 1646–47, see R. Kerr, *Correspondence*, I, lxxiv, 167, 189, 199, 205.

and other Scottish "craftsmen" present in the city with the radical Masons in the Covenanters' army.

Joining the royalist Scots at Newcastle was the king's physician Dr. William Maxwell, who would later attend the Edinburgh lodge with Moray and Hamilton.⁹⁸ As noted earlier, Maxwell had been friendly with Fludd and was possibly the author of the Frizius treatise on Rosicrucianism. Thus, it was no coincidence that in "The Scots Apostasie," written while the king was at Newcastle, Cleveland utilized Hermetic imagery to charge the Scots with alchemical deception and treacherous brotherhood. Were their negotiations just a "a trick of state?/Like chymists tinctures, prov'd adulterate?"⁹⁹ Was the "fabrick of your Brotherhood,/Projected first in such a forge of sin" that it was "fit for the grand Devils hammering?"

While the embittered Cleveland fled the north for the clandestine world of royalist publishing in London, Moray and the moderate Scots may have encouraged further Masonic recruitments among the king's supporters in England. A rare surviving document of Masonic initiation suggests the spread of Scottish-style Masonry among royalist English troops, while Charles was still in Newcastle. On 16 October 1646 Elias Ashmole made a coded record in his diary:

I was made a Free Mason at Warrington in Lancashire, with Coll: Henry Mainwaring of Karincham in Cheshire.

The names of those that were then of the Lodge, Mr: Rich Penket Warden, Mr: James Collier, Mr: Rich: Sankey, Henry Littler, John Ellam, Rich: Ellam & Hugh Brewer.¹⁰⁰

Before we examine the composition and significance of this lodge, it will be useful to sketch the career of Ashmole, who shared many of the heterodox antiquarian, occult, and political interests of Moray's Scottish network.

Like his friend Dugdale, Ashmole was appalled at the sacking of Westminster Abbey and other churches by parliamentary radicals, and he maintained an antiquarian reverence for great architecture. In 1644 he offered his services to Charles I at Oxford, where he

⁹⁸ D. Stevenson, *First Freemasons*, 25, 28.

⁹⁹ J. Cleveland, *Poems*, 67–68.

¹⁰⁰ C.H. Josten, ed., *Elias Ashmole (1617–1692)* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1966), II, 395–96.

also studied astrology, mathematics, and natural science. At this time, Ashmole began keeping a diary in cipher, which he based on John Willis's system of stenography. He initially used the cipher to relay military intelligence between royalist encampments. Ashmole also studied and annotated Willis's *Ars Mnemonica* (1618), which drew on Pythagoras, Pico, Cardano, and the "Admirable Crichton" for its techniques.¹⁰¹ Willis offered simplified instruction in the "masonic" practice of Memory:

The Art of Memorie . . . consisteth of two parts: *Repositum*, and *Depositorium* . . . A *Repositorie* is an imaginary house or building—made of stone, with marble stage, groove and Corinthian pillar . . . And such a fashioned *Repositorie* are we to prefix before the eyes of our mind.¹⁰²

Willis included charts on hand movements and signals, techniques of secret communication which would later be considered the special expertise of masons. These codes and signals would certainly have proved useful to Ashmole's intelligence work.

Perhaps his training to become an artillery officer further piqued Ashmole's interest in Freemasonry, for Moray, Hamilton, and other Scots in the royalist party combined an interest in gunnery and masonry. Moreover, John Mylne—the king's master mason in Scotland—now served as his master gunner.¹⁰³ In July 1646 Ashmole's troops were forced to surrender at Worcester, and he reluctantly signed the articles which prohibited him from taking up arms against the English Parliament. Thus, when he and other royalists joined the Warrington lodge in October, they probably intended to utilize Masonic networks while they secretly worked for the cause. Ashmole's companion in initiation was his cousin, Colonel Henry Mainwaring of Cheshire, who was long believed by Masonic historians to have been an antagonist of the king. In an important correction to this tradition, Stevenson observes:

Henry Mainwaring has usually been described as serving parliament in the war, and this has led to the Warrington Lodge frequently being

¹⁰¹ The Bodleian copy is catalogued as Ashmole MS. 949, with marginalia by Ashmole.

¹⁰² John Willis, *The Art of Memory, so far as it dependeth upon Places and Ideas* (London, 1621), 1, 8, 21.

¹⁰³ Charles I appointed Mylne as Captain of Pioneers and principle Master Gunner for Scotland in 1646; see R.S. Mylne, *Master Masons*, 140.

cited as a precocious example of masonic tolerance, comprehending men who had just fought on opposite sides in a bitter civil war. Further, the fact that one or two of the lodge's members may have been Catholics has been taken as evidence of a tolerant attitude to religion as well as politics. In fact, though Henry Mainwaring had begun the war fighting for parliament, he had soon changed sides. Thus it was two royalist officers who entered the lodge in 1646. Lancashire's many Catholics had also supported the king, so if there were Catholics in the lodge this merely confirms that, far from being above political and religious squabbles, it was an organization in which royalists may have sought consolation from defeat in brotherhood.¹⁰⁴

Unaware of the Scottish Masonic background, Josten relied upon English Masonic historians when he tried to explain Ashmole's initiation, "together with his Roundhead friend":

Ashmole's note of his masonic initiation is the earliest known record of speculative freemasonry in an English lodge. Nevertheless, the note evidences an advanced stage rather than the beginning of the evolution by which the lodges of craft masons were gradually transformed into esoteric societies of gentlemen and of members of all professions and trades; for recent research has shown that, in all probability, not only Ashmole but Colonel Henry Manwaring, but all of the seven other freemasons, whose names are given, were in no way connected with operative masonry. The note also provides valuable evidence of the non-political and non-denominational character of English freemasonry in the seventeenth century.¹⁰⁵

Unfortunately, this inaccurate English version of the events at Warrington became conventional wisdom and helped to mislead generations of scholars about the early history of Freemasonry. Given the new perspective provided by Stevenson, the fact that Charles I, a "Mason King," was then in the company and custody of Scottish Masons in the north of England yields a new strategic significance to the initiations at Warrington.

The lodge member Richard Sankey came from a Catholic land-owning family, and it was evidently his son Edward who made a copy of the Masonic constitution used at Ashmole's admission. Now known as Sloane MS. #3848, Edward's transcript was dated 16 October 1646, and it recapitulated the late medieval history of the craft given in the Cooke manuscript. In that early period, operative

¹⁰⁴ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 219.

¹⁰⁵ C. Josten, *Ashmole*, I, 34.

stonemasons in France, England, and Scotland shared similar traditions. Thus, Ashmole and his brothers were taught the traditional lore of the two Hermetic pillars, Abraham's instruction of Euclid, Solomon's employment of Hiram Abif, Charles Martel's patronage of French masons, and the masonic assembly at York.¹⁰⁶ Of particular relevance to the royalists was the charge that the mason must be true to the king and to warn him of any treachery.

Though English Masonic historians have long held that Ashmole's statement—"those who were then of the lodge"—implied previous and additional members and thus the "antiquity" of Freemasonry in Warrington, Stevenson disagrees.¹⁰⁷ He argues that there is no evidence that the lodge "gradually evolved out of an operative organization and thus had a long previous history"; in fact, it could "equally well have been created the day before Ashmole joined it."¹⁰⁸ I suggest that Ashmole was initiated in a mobile military lodge, for which no fixed meeting-room was required, since the wardens or masters often carried their documents with them. Lepper cites Moray's initiation in "an ambulatory lodge" at Newcastle as evidence of the spread of this Scottish custom to the north of England.¹⁰⁹

Many of the ambulatory initiations were performed by oral instruction, requiring the master or "warden" to utilize the Art of Memory in order to carry such a long traditional history in his head. If the lodge was influenced by the Scottish Masons in the king's army, perhaps Sankey had to write down the "The free Masons orders and constitutions" for new, non-operative recruits who were not trained in the mnemonic art. Stevenson notes that after Ashmole's 1646 mention of the Warrington lodge, it is never heard of again, and in this it is typical of seventeenth-century English lodges—an isolated reference is followed by total silence.¹¹⁰ That Ashmole's note occurred in an enciphered, private diary suggests not only that secrecy was required but that other royalists may have joined lodges for which no record survives. This point will become important when we exam-

¹⁰⁶ The MS. is in the British Library; facsimile in G.W. Speth, ed., *Masonic Reprints of the Lodge Quatuor Coronati*, #2076. London (Margate: Keble's Gazette, 1891), vol. III, part II, i-vi.

¹⁰⁷ See R. Gould, *History*, II, 266.

¹⁰⁸ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 219-20.

¹⁰⁹ John Herron Lepper, "'The Poor Common Soldier,' a Study of Irish Ambulatory Warrants," *AQC*, 38 (1925), 151.

¹¹⁰ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 220.

ine Masonic-sounding language in the writings of royalists who participated in the circles of Ashmole, Moray, Ramsay, and other known Freemasons.

Immediately after the Masonic meeting, Mainwaring supplied Ashmole with horse and money in order to secretly travel to London (in defiance of Parliament's orders), where he joined an underground network of Paracelsan physicians, Rosicrucian chemists, astrologers, and mathematicians who clandestinely served the royalist cause. As Josten observes, "Perhaps his newly acquired masonic connexions had influenced Ashmole's decision."¹¹¹ Ashmole intended to collaborate with George Wharton, a royalist astrologer, to counter the parliamentary propaganda issued by the Roundhead astrologer William Lilly. On 20 November, when Ashmole was introduced to Lilly by Jonas Moore, a royalist mathematician, the king's men probably intended to spy on and manipulate Lilly's astrological readings. That Ashmole and Lilly eventually became friends was rooted in their mutual occult interests which over-rode their political differences. Back in Warrington, Ashmole's Masonic brothers may have participated in the secret plotting that led to a royalist uprising there some years later.

Meanwhile in Newcastle, Moray realized that the king would never sign the Covenant, despite his willingness to listen to Presbyterian arguments from the Reverend Alexander Henderson. Drawing on Scotland's Hermetic-Jewish traditions, Henderson quoted Pico della Mirandola on the "supremacy of reason as against the will," and portrayed "Jacob and the Kings of Judah as Reformers."¹¹² Moray was the lone witness to their theological exchanges, and he transcribed the positions of king and preacher and mediated their debates.¹¹³ In the process, his admiration for Charles's spiritual serenity and "tranquil insouciance" grew, despite "events of evil import for his interests."¹¹⁴ Even Henderson expressed admiration for Charles's theological expertise and subtle reasoning. However, by December 1646 the Scottish Parliament gave up on its negotiations with the king, who had not fulfilled his end of the bargain by signing the Covenant, and they agreed to turn him over to the English Parliament. That

¹¹¹ C. Josten, *Ashmole*, I, 36; II, 399.

¹¹² F. Routledge, *Calendar . . . Clarendon*, I, 320.

¹¹³ G. Burnet, *Memoirs of . . . Hamilton*, 277.

¹¹⁴ A. Robertson, *Moray*, 51.

the English also agreed to pay the Scottish army half of its arrears of salary (£100,000 sterling) gave the transaction a mercenary connotation which stained Scotland's honor for decades.

Believing that the Independents intended harm to the king, Moray and his cousin William Murray made arrangements for Charles to escape in disguise and flee to an awaiting ship. They were probably assisted by Dr. Maxwell, the king's physician. However, the plan was leaked, the guards reinforced, and the king hesitated until it was too late. In January Lothian and Balcarres were sent as Scottish commissioners to the king, and they joined Moray in his efforts to salvage the royalist cause.¹¹⁵ When the Commons voted to move Charles to Holmby House outside of London, Moray offered to accompany him and to subsequently manage his escape. However, his plan was thwarted, and Moray wrote disconsolately to the French minister Du Bosc:

The news that one can communicate to you is so sad that I have not courage enough to relate it to you in detail. In one word, before Saturday next, the King of Great Britain will be in the hands of the English. Permit me then to add nothing further.¹¹⁶

Lothian was allowed to accompany Charles to Holmby, where he spent several weeks with him, but the royalists sensed the king's impending doom.

Though the Covenanters had proudly boasted of their Judaic steadfastness in maintaining their sacred bond with the God of Israel, the Scottish army was shocked by the "anti-Semitic" invective heaped upon them as they marched out of Newcastle in February. When English mobs shouted that the northern soldiers were Jews who sold their king for money, they initiated a long period of anti-Scottish propaganda that identified Scots with Jews, for better or worse. However, with the radical Covenanters in the ascendancy in both kingdoms, John Dury was proud of the "Judaizing" tendencies of his countrymen. Having returned to England, Dury subscribed to the Covenant of the Three Kingdoms in August 1645 and resumed his work with Hartlib on projects to convert the Jews. In November he preached before the House of Commons on "Israel's call to march

¹¹⁵ R. Kerr, *Correspondence*, I, lxxiv-vi.

¹¹⁶ A. Robertson, *Moray*, 55-56.

out of Babylon and into Jerusalem."¹¹⁷ Dury convinced the Commons that he was now loyal to them, and in March 1647 he was appointed to educate the king's younger children—James, Elizabeth, and Henry—whom Parliament had placed under the guardianship of the Earl of Northumberland.

Because little is known of Dury's activities as royal tutor, the question of whether he tried to infuse Rosicrucian- or Antillian-style notions in the classroom is unanswerable. He certainly accepted the arguments of Hartlib and Comenius that the special education of children would form the basis of the projected community. At this time, there was also a possible Masonic influence on the educational theories of Dury and Hartlib. They continued their confidential relationship with David Ramsay and his son William, who believed in Rosicrucian-Masonic reform programs. Hartlib hoped that a prophecy given to Ramsay—that one of the kings of Britain shall have the Lapis "from a Scotsman as it were out of his family"—would be fulfilled within four years.¹¹⁸ However, Hartlib also feared Papist competition, for Kircher and his Jesuit colleagues "apply Mathematicks to Experiments and Mechanicks, etc., in order 'to make a great blaze of all things, etc. so as to attract more admirers and contributors to their order.'"

Dury and Hartlib had another Masonic correspondent in Balthazar Gerbier, architect to Buckingham and Charles I. Appealing to their pansophic interests, Gerbier hoped to establish an educational academy and "Bureau d'Adresse" in London. In 1641 Charles I had named Gerbier as Master of Ceremonies, and he hoped to succeed Inigo Jones as Surveyor of Works.¹¹⁹ Gerbier was currently in Paris, where he had fled after a parliamentary mob attacked his house in September 1642. Though his son fought for the king at Oxford, Gerbier eventually fell out of favor with Davenant and other exiles, who were aware that he sent a "protestation of his loyalty to the Commonwealth government" in 1643.¹²⁰ He also wrote to Hartlib that "having lost 30 years about courts and princes," he now wanted to serve "a harmless public." Long owed money by the king and

¹¹⁷ G. Turnbull, *Hartlib, Dury, and Comenius*, 252.

¹¹⁸ Hartlib Papers, 32/22/1A. Ephemerides, part 1 (January-June 1648).

¹¹⁹ Edward Chaney, *The Evolution of the Grand Tour* (London: Frank Cass, 1998), 59–63, 220; "Balthazar Gerbier," *DNB*.

¹²⁰ British Library Add. MS.32093.ff.302–07.

deeply in debt, Gerbier hoped Hartlib would use his influence with Parliament to support his academy. To this end, he asked Hartlib to distribute his pamphlet, *To all Fathers of Families and Lovers of Knowledge and Virtues* (1648), which outlined his scheme. From his earlier career under two Stuart kings and from his explicit references to Freemasonry later, it is clear that Gerbier's proposal was influenced by his Masonic activities.

Drawing on his experience with Buckingham in domestic and military architecture and with Jones in masque architecture, Gerbier argued the importance of "the true experimental natural philosophy":

... also whatsoever is most needful and noble in the Mathematicks, viz. Arithmetic, Geometry, Cosmography, Perspective, and Architecture, "both that for building, and that for magnificent shows, and in particular the secret motions of scenes and the like"; but above all (as the most excellent of practical mathematics) whatsoever belongeth to Fortifications, Besieging and Defending of places, fireworks, ordering of battles and marching of armies.¹²¹

Though Hartlib warned Gerbier that the English universities would oppose his scheme, he must also have worried about Parliament's distrust of the king's former architect. Nevertheless, Gerbier continued to send Hartlib information about his plans, which Hartlib passed on to Dury, who evidently recommended Aberdeen, rather than London, as a more suitable site for the academy.

During this period, while Hartlib and Dury dreamed of colleges of Jewish studies, languages, and mathematics, Dury must have discussed their plans with his uncle Ramsay, who was permitted by Parliament to pursue his work in mechanics and mining.¹²² From Ramsay's occult manuscripts, it is clear that he sympathized with Dury's investigations of Jewish lore. Did Ramsay also communicate his knowledge of Jewish traditions within Freemasonry? Though Ramsay remained privately loyal to the king, his sympathy for the Covenanting cause gained him an uneasy tolerance from Parliament, which allowed him to participate in the same shadowy network of Rosicrucian chemists and royalist Masons to which Ashmole belonged. In fact, Ashmole came to count on Ramsay as a friend and collaborator.¹²³

¹²¹ Balthazar Gerbier, *Counsel and Advice for All Builders* (London, 1663), 58; for Masonic references, see 28–42, 53–58, 93.

¹²² "David Ramsay," *DNB*.

¹²³ E. Ashmole, *Diary*, II, 521, 560, 599.

Thus, it is possible that Dury recognized the potential interest of Freemasons in Rabbi Leon's model of the Temple. Moreover, the Masonic notions of Ramsay and Gerbier influenced Dury and Hartlib in 1647 to add "a college for Baconian experimental philosophy" and "a college for inventions in mechanical arts and industry" to their projected college of Jewish studies.¹²⁴ According to Turnbull, it was Dury who added the skills of architecture and surveying to the educational scheme.¹²⁵

In 1648 Hartlib studied Wotton's *Elements of Architecture*, and he was especially impressed by the concept of education as "Moral Architecture." Referring to the Bohemian prophet Cyprian Kinner, he hoped that he "may be wholly set apart in the quality of a Master-builder," for then "the said Architecture might yet be set forward" and "accomplish the thorough Reformation of these Covenanted Kingdoms."¹²⁶ These architectural-educational plans, made during the two years when Dury educated Charles I's children, raise a provocative question—did he know that their father was a "Mason King"?

Meanwhile, in the midst of the king's worsening situation, his supporters in Scotland sent Alexander Seton, Third Earl of Dunfermline, to Henrietta Maria in Paris with a proposal that she send Prince Charles to Scotland. Now in Edinburgh, Moray supported the proposal, and he labored to bring together rival religious and familial factions for military support of the prince's campaign. As noted earlier, Dunfermline was probably a Freemason, and the organizational effort involved a Masonic network. On 27 July 1647 John Mylne, deacon of the lodge of Edinburgh, presided over a meeting in which Dr. William Maxwell was admitted, while Moray, Alexander Hamilton, and five other brothers signed their approval.¹²⁷ At this point, a provocative merging of Rosicrucian and Masonic interests developed within the royalist camp.

When Maxwell chose a flower as his Mason's Mark, he perhaps alluded to his own Rosicrucian interests. In the Rosicrucian treatise by Frizius, sometimes attributed to Maxwell, the frontispiece featured a rose and bee (often used as Rosicrucian and Masonic emblems

¹²⁴ See R. Popkin, "First College," 352.

¹²⁵ G. Turnbull, *Hartlib, Dury, and Comenius*, 50–51.

¹²⁶ Hartlib Papers, 39/2/150A; 7/6/1A (Hartlib to Rous, 27 November 1648).

¹²⁷ D. Stevenson, *First Freemasons*, 25, 28.

respectively). While working with Maxwell in 1647, Moray married Sophia Lindsay, daughter of the First Earl of Balcarres, whose collection of Rosicrucian translations and Hermetic manuscripts remained in the possession of his daughter and son, Alexander Lindsay, now Second Earl of Balcarres. Moray collaborated closely with his new brother-in-law, who shared his moderate Presbyterian position, mystical interests, and Masonic associations. Both men were also close to Lothian, who with his father Ancram collected Rosicrucian and architectural-masonic works for their library at Newbattle Abbey.¹²⁸

The royalists sent Traquair, a fellow Mason, to London to persuade the king of the viability of their plan, in which Prince Charles would lead a Scottish army against the English. However, negotiations stalled while the king played off one English faction against another, in the hope that some of the sectarians would eventually support his cause. The delay worried the Scottish royalists, and General Middleton was especially disturbed when a second-sighted Highlander predicted to him that Charles I would be executed and that his son would reclaim the throne only after several failed attempts.¹²⁹

Gregg notes that after Charles's removal to Hampton Court in July 1647, "captivity sat lightly upon the King and he had many visitors."¹³⁰ Among them was an emissary from John Sparrow, a Puritan lawyer, who had just completed the first English translation of a work by Jacob Boehme, a German shoemaker and theosophist, who died in 1624. The unnamed agent was possibly Ashmole, who was one of the few Englishmen to have seen Boehmenist manuscripts and who frequently visited the king in July.¹³¹ Though Sparrow was a staunch Puritan, he lamented the increasing fragmentation of the country into quarreling sects, and he undertook the Boehme translations as an antidote to sectarian division. As Sparrow later recalled, his friend presented *XL Questions Concerning the Soule* (1647) to the king, "who vouchsafed the perusal of it." After a month, Sparrow recorded Charles's opinion of the work:

He answered that the publisher in English seemed to say of the Author, that he was no Scholar, and if he were not the Holy Ghost was now

¹²⁸ Kerr's library.

¹²⁹ John Aubrey, *Miscellanies*, 2nd rev. ed. (London: A Bettesworth and J. Baltley, 1721), 79.

¹³⁰ P. Gregg, *Charles I*, 417.

¹³¹ E. Ashmole, *Diary*, II, 453–54; J. Andrew Mendelsohn, "Alchemy and Politics in England, 1649–1665," *Past and Present*, 185 (1992), 34–35.

in Men, but if he were a Scholar, it was one of the best inventions that ever he read. I need not add the Censure [judgment] of any other Person, knowing none to compare with this one way or other.¹³²

The king's sympathetic response to Boehme is suggestive, for the German visionary expressed a pacifist version of Rosicrucianism strikingly similar to that of James Maxwell, George Erskine, David Lindsay, and Robert Kerr (Ancram). Moreover, Boehme drew much of his alchemical imagery (especially *salitter* or *sal niter*) from Alexander Seton, the wandering Scottish adept who passed through Germany in the early 1600's.¹³³ Though historians have long associated the English translations of Boehme with radical Protestants, Mendelsohn notes that his first proponents (Sparrow and Charles Hotham, university preacher at Cambridge) were supporters of the king and used Boehme's writings as "a weapon against disobedient subjects."¹³⁴

Charles I's interest in *XL Questions Concerning the Soule* is suggestive, for it was one of Boehme's most Cabalistic works. The shoemaker replied to the probing questions of Dr. Balthasar Walter, an erudite physician who had travelled to Palestine and Egypt in search of Cabalistic-Hermetic wisdom. When Boehme described ten "forms" of fire to account for the origin of the soul, he drew upon the ten *sephirot* of the Cabala.¹³⁵ Boehme may have learned some Cabala directly from Rabbi Jacob Loew of Prague, whom Walter had visited and who visited Boehme's hometown of Görlitz in 1600. While he also drew on Reuchlin, Paracelsus, and other Christian Cabalists, Boehme affirmed unusually ecumenical principles in which the illuminated people of all religions—including Jews, Turks, and heathens—could achieve salvation.

Though Boehme was influenced by Rosicrucian theories of alchemy and corresponded with members of the brotherhood in Lübeck in 1622, he did not share the radical anti-Catholicism of the political Rosicrucians. He lamented the deposition of the Winter King of Bohemia but did not support a continuing military struggle to restore him. In fact, he opposed all violence in the name of religion. As

¹³² Jacob Boehme, *Forty Questions Concerning the Soul*, trans. John Sparrow (London, 1651), preface.

¹³³ Andrew Weeks, *Boehme: An Intellectual Biography of a Seventeenth-century Philosopher and Mystic* (Albany: State University of New York, 1991), 67, 234.

¹³⁴ J. Mendelsohn, "Alchemy and Politics," 35–36.

¹³⁵ A. Weeks, *Boehme*, 146–47.

Sparrow noted, in the volume he sent to Charles I, Boehme's work should bring to an end "all the disturbing sects and heresies arising from the darknesse of men and Devils." Moreover, "they that rule will perceive how to effect all their good purposes . . . and Subjects will soone learne to obey in everything as Primitive Martyrs did." This pacific form of Rosicrucian theosophy had long appealed to Scots with Masonic associations, and it was fitting that Ashmole—who was probably initiated in a Scottish-style field lodge—was one of the earliest readers of Boehme in England.

There is no evidence of Boehme's connection with masonry in Germany, but he sympathized with the struggle of local craft fraternities against clerical oppression. Through his artisan and alchemical contacts, he became associated with a clandestine brotherhood, which he called "the children of the secret" or "the hidden congregation."¹³⁶ Hinting at stages of initiation, he asserted the importance of the art of *Cirkel-Messen*, or measuring with compasses, which he used when drawing complex geometric emblems for his theosophical publications. That Boehme expressed his spiritual discoveries in terms of craft apprenticeship was not lost on Sparrow, who urged his readers to grant the same seriousness to spiritual apprenticeship as they gave to practical training. In the preface to *Mysterium Magnum* (1654), Sparrow encouraged readers to stick with the challenge of Boehme's difficult concepts:

These are the tedious searches that most Men wander about in mechanical things. It is frequent with men to be apprentices seven years to learne a Trade, or as they properly call it a Mysterie, and because it is their employment by which Men get their livelyhoods, they are loathe to divulge it . . . yet so much paines as taken for a poore transitorie benefit.¹³⁷

Meanwhile in Scotland, Moray, Murray, Lothian, Balcarres, and the moderate Covenanters collaborated in their campaign to reconcile religious factions in order to unite Scotland behind the king. The volatile sectarianism that spread from England to Scotland after the Bishops' War provoked an anquished publication from the radical Covenanter Samuel Rutherford, who argued in 1648 that "it is undeniable that thousands of people are carried away to Familisme,"

¹³⁶ Ibid., 42–43, 96, 176.

¹³⁷ Jacob Boehme, *Mysterium Magnum* (London, 1654), translator's preface.

which he equated with a policy of religious toleration.¹³⁸ Hating the Independents as much as the royalists, Rutherford worried that the Familists "would love to have King Charles of their way, for they talk much of liberty of conscience." Giving a biographical account of Hendrik Niklaes, he claimed that H.N. came to England, where he seduced "a number of artificers." He further associated the Familists with the German Teutonic Order "or in French the Knights of Rhodes." Was Rutherford responding to some effort by Masonic "artificers" to utilize Familist and chivalric values to conciliate factions? Defending Scotland's Jewish heritage, Rutherford concluded that "though the Covenant were buried, it must rise from the dead againe, that the Lord must make his Jerusalem in Britaine."

While laboring to unify such millenarians and hotheads into a patriotic front, Moray's efforts to recruit troops for the French were hampered by the English Parliament's suspicions that he meant to use those troops in a foreign invasion in support of the royalists. In May 1648 Moray left for France, where he brought news to Henrietta Maria of the "Engagement," an oath-bound commitment of many Scots to the king's cause. He was ordered to persuade the queen to send Prince Charles to Scotland. In July John Maitland, Second Earl of Lauderdale, was also sent to France and Holland, where he was to solicit money and arms for a Scottish invasion of England. However, news of the defeat of the Scottish army at Preston reached Moray and Lauderdale in August, and their efforts for the "Engagement" would meet increasing obstacles.

The two Scots did develop a trusting relationship with the young Stuart prince, and it is possible that they initiated him into Freemasonry at this time. According to Anderson, the future Charles II became a Mason while on the Continent.¹³⁹ Moreover, French Freemasons long preserved an oral tradition that a lodge was formed by Stuart partisans at St. Germain-en-Laye in 1649.¹⁴⁰ That Moray developed a fraternal bond with the prince is suggested by his later correspondence, in which he used Masonic terminology to prove his

¹³⁸ Samuel Rutherford, *A Survey of the Spirituall Antichrist, Opening the Secrets of Familisme and Antinomianism* (London, 1648), I, i-iii, 164-68, 350.

¹³⁹ J. Anderson, *Constitutions* (1723), 41; (1738), 101.

¹⁴⁰ J. Bertellot, "Les franc-maçons devant l'Histoire," *Monde Neveau* (1949), 43-44; Ch. Chevalier, "Maçons écossais au XVIII^e siècle," *Annales historiques de la Révolution française* (September 1969), 393-408.

loyalty and service.¹⁴¹ If the initiation of Prince Charles took place in 1648–49, it would be consistent with his father's current Masonic interests.

Disturbed by the increasingly violent language of the debates in Parliament, where the Presbyterians were defeated by the Independents who controlled the army, Charles I began to fear for his life. Encouraged by reports from his Scottish supporters, the king escaped in November and took refuge in Carisbrooke Castle on the Isle of Wight. In December Lauderdale and two Scottish commissioners arrived on the island, where they negotiated a secret Treaty of Engagement. The king agreed to confirm the Covenant in both kingdoms by Act of Parliament, though it was not to be forced on unwilling subjects. An agreement was made for cooperation between Scottish, English, and Irish royalists. The king would employ Scotsmen equally with Englishmen, and the royal family would frequently visit Scotland. The English royalist historian Edward Hyde (later Lord Clarendon) would accuse Lauderdale of forcing "monstrous concessions," from the king "in that season of despair," which trenched "far upon the honour and interest of the English."¹⁴² As a "Mason King," did Charles view the Engagement as a Masonic bonding of "honest" men? The term "honest" became increasingly identified with loyalty to the Stuarts, and it would later be used in the Lauderdale-Moray, as well as eighteenth-century Jacobite-Masonic, correspondence.¹⁴³

During his twelve-month stay at Carisbrooke, Charles retrieved his most beloved books, including Villalpando's Lullist treatise on the Solomonic Temple, which he studied carefully. He also received visits from Webb, who carried architectural plans from Jones and who spoke optimistically about the construction work to be carried out on the final stages of Whitehall Palace, Charles's own attempt to equal or outshine the Escorial. Did the king also study Rabbi Leon's treatise on the Temple, which the Jewish architect had given to Henrietta Maria? He carefully annotated Bacon's *Advancement of Learning*, with its program for educated fraternities of artificers. He

¹⁴¹ D. Stevenson, "Masonry," 409.

¹⁴² W.C. Mackenzie, *The Life and Times of John Mailland, Duke of Lauderdale (1616–1682)* (London: Kegan Paul, 1929), 123–29.

¹⁴³ On "honest" as a code-word, see Ian Higgins, *Swift's Politics: A Study in Disaffection* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994), 79.

cherished the regalia of the Order of the Garter, while he studied Tasso's *Godfrey of Bouloigne*, with its tribute to the chivalric fraternities who reclaimed Jerusalem and the Temple.

When Cromwell and the army brought the king to London for trial and ordered his execution on 30 January 1649, they initiated a long tradition of Charles I as a Masonic martyr. It was ironically fitting that the king stepped onto the scaffold through a window of the Banqueting House—the epitome of Stuart architectural and masque culture. Decades later, when the Jacobite supporters of his grandson James "III" developed Templar degrees of vengeance, they drew on bitter memories of that scene in 1649.¹⁴⁴ The shock of the execution, which reverberated through all classes and all nations, stimulated soul-searching and heaven-probing that issued in a barrage of partisan writings, whose authors sought justifications for the violent actions of both sides—king-killers and king-defenders.

The pamphlet war was stimulated by the sensational publication on the day of the king's execution of his apologia written in prison and entitled *Eikon Basilike*, or "The Image of the King." In it, Charles (via his editor Bishop Gauden) defended his actions since 1640 and prayed for personal and public forgiveness, mercy, and peace. Though he described the monetary transaction of the Scottish army as Judas-like, he defended the sincerity of their Covenant and recognized that Episcopacy was not a native growth in that country.¹⁴⁵ However, he deplored the militant Scots' determination to impose the Covenant on unwilling subjects in England. Charles claimed that he, unlike the iconoclastic sectarians, maintained the same Hebraic traditions that the Scots revered. He followed the precedents established by David and Solomon, who combined the "regal and sacerdotal" in their own persons. Harking back to his father's peaceful reign, he reminded his subjects of the unparalleled prosperity of Solomon's court.

Furthermore, it was the Old Testament God "Who appointed several orders and a prelacy in the government of His church among the Jewish priests," so it was "not likely" that God "should abhor them among Christian ministers." While maintaining the royal prerogative and established Church of England, Charles called for a

¹⁴⁴ [Nicholas de Bonneville], *La Maçonnerie écossaise comparée avec les trois professions et le secret de Templiers du 14^e siècle* (Orient de Londres [Hamburg], 1788), part I, 17–20.

¹⁴⁵ See Charles I, *Eikon Basilike: The Portraiture of His Sacred Majesty in His Solitudes and Sufferings*, ed. Philip Knachel (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1966), 104, 110, 144, 159.

general amnesty and a cessation of Parliament's brutal retaliation against the Catholic rebels in Ireland. Moreover, minor differences between religious beliefs should be tolerated under the guidance of a uniformly national church. Charles specifically identified the proliferating sects with the destroyers of the architecture of Jerusalem:

That the builders of Babel should from division fall to confusion is no wonder; but for those that pretend to build Jerusalem to divide their tongues and hands is but an ill omen and sounds too like the fury of those zealots whose intestine bitterness and divisions were the greatest occasion of the last fatal destruction of that city.¹⁴⁶

While he wept over the fate of Jerusalem, he hoped "That the stone which some builders refuse may become the headstone of the corner," and he prayed, "Thou, O Lord, canst at once make me Thy temple, Thy priest, Thy sacrifice, and Thine altar." The potency of this appeal to the Scots and to royalist Masons made *Eikon Basilike* a manifesto of renewed commitment to the Solomonic dreams of the Stuart dynasty.

The work was immensely popular in Britain and abroad and, as editions poured from many presses, Cromwell recognized that a powerful counterblast must be issued. Thus, he commissioned the erudite polemicist John Milton to write *Eikonoklastes*, which exploited the anti-architecture, anti-masque hostility of the radical Puritans. Milton proudly identified himself with the "Many Greek Emperors" sur-named *Iconoclastes*, "who in their zeal to the command of God, after long tradition of Idolatry in the Church, took courage, and broke all superstitious Images to peeces." Recognizing the emotional power of the engraved frontispiece to *Eikon Basilike*, which portrayed a prayerful Charles gazing at his heavenly crown while his earthly crown falls by his foot, Milton scorned the *Eikon* as typical of manipulative masque-techniques:

And how much their intent, who publish'd these overlate Apologies and Meditations of the dead King, drives to same end of stirring up the people . . . it appears both by the conceited portraiture before his Book, drawn out to the full measure of a Masking Scene, and sett there to catch fools and silly gazers, and by those Latin words after the end, *Vota dabunt quae Bella negarunt*; intimating that what hee could not compass by War, he should achieve by his Meditations. . . . But quaint Emblems and devices begg'd from the old Paegentry of some

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 153; also, 94, 147.

Twelf-nights entertainment at *Whitehall*, will doe but ill to make a Saint or Martyr.¹⁴⁷

After linking the Stuarts' masques with Papism, Milton further linked their architecture and sculpture with anti-Protestant beliefs:

Not to justifie what enormities the Vulgar may committ in the rudeness of their zeal, we need but only instance how he [Charles I] bemoanes the *pulling down of crosses* and other Superstitious Monuments, as the effect of a *popular and deceitful Reformation*. How little this savours of a Protestant, is too easily perceav'd.¹⁴⁸

Milton had earlier proved his propaganda skills to Cromwell, when he published *The Tenure of Kings* (1648), in which he blamed the Scots for the king's imprisonment by the English army, scorned them for their renewed support of Charles, and mocked them as "these blind and lame Defenders of Jerusalem."¹⁴⁹ Ridiculing the Hebraic pretensions of royalist Presbyterians, he identified them with the Samaritan magician Simon Magus. In *Eikonoklastes*, he elaborated on this hint at Jewish *cacomagie* by reviving the radicals' charge that Buckingham poisoned James I, with the connivance of Charles. He then argued that the death of Britain's Solomon was good riddance, because James had been so frightened by the Gunpowder Plot that he "was hitt into such a *Hectic* shivering between Protestant and Papist all his life after, that he never durst from that time doe otherwise then equivocat or collogue with the Pope and his adherants."

The royalist pretension to Hebraic precedents was further exposed by Charles's disapproval of those parliamentarians "who threatn'd all extremity" to the Irish rebels, for "did not all *Israel* do as much against the *Benjamites* for one Rape committed by a few?" To the king's complaints about Parliament's publication of his private correspondence, Milton responded that the writers were a "Sect of those Cabalists" who deserved exposure and punishment. As Thompson notes, Charles I was "an adept in the use of ciphers, based on complicated numerals," in which the numbers and letters were often written "from left to right, as the Semites do."¹⁵⁰ Milton was aware

¹⁴⁷ John Milton, *The Works of John Milton*, ed. F.A. Patterson (New York: Columbia UP, 1932), V, 67-68.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., V, 248.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., V, 38, 57-59, 76, 196-97, 252.

¹⁵⁰ James Thompson and Saul Padover, *Secret Diplomacy: Espionage and Cryptography* (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1963), 161.

that the royalists' "Cabalistic" codes were usually undecipherable to Cromwell's intelligencers.

However, Milton was stung into unusual defensiveness by the king's charge that the sectarians were destroying Jerusalem:

He censures, and in censuring seems to hope *it will be an ill Omen* that they *who build Jerusalem divide their tongues and hands*. But his hope fail'd him with his example; for that there were divisions both of tongues and hands at the building of *Jerusalem*, the Story would have certifi'd him; and yet the work prosper'd; and if God will, so may this; notwithstanding all the craft and malignant wiles of *Sanballat* and *Tobiah*, adding what fuell they can to our dissensions; or the indignity of his comparison that lik'ns us to those seditious *Zelots* whose *intestine fury* brought destruction to the last *Jerusalem*.¹⁵¹

As discussed earlier, the deep cultural division between Tudor preference for the word and Stuart preference for the image fueled the radical Protestant hostility to the Solomonic architectural and masque pretensions of James I and Charles I. Potter's observations on the *Eikon* versus *Eikonklastes* controversy illuminate the persistence of this cleavage in the wake of Charles I's execution:

It is important to realise how completely, until his death, Charles I was a king of images rather than words . . . One of the reasons why spectacle is so much a part of monarchy is that the visual without the verbal always retains a sense of mystery . . . In masques and triumphs, for instance, the figure of supreme authority is never the one who speaks; the audience hears only personifications of his or her attributes. When, in addition, the machinery of the spectacle is hidden, the various miracles involved in the change of scenes can be attributed to the presence of the silent, wonder-working monarch.¹⁵²

In the eighteenth-century, when partisans of the Stuarts once again experienced cultural suppression and political exile, the emergence of elaborately theatrical and mystical rituals in the high degrees of *Écossais* Freemasonry was probably rooted in the tragic scenario of 1649.¹⁵³

¹⁵¹ J. Milton, *Works*, V, 272.

¹⁵² Lois Potter, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989), 157.

¹⁵³ For an important illustrated account of the masque-like staging of these rituals in late 19th – early 20th century Scottish Rite lodges, see C. Brockman, *Theatre of the Fraternity*.

Among the mourners who gathered in Paris to comfort the new Stuart claimant to the throne, the eighteen year-old Charles II, was Sir Robert Moray, who transmuted his sorrow and his hope into an ecumenical, mystical vision of Freemasonry that would console his exiled brothers, as they labored to restore the Temple in the Stuart kingdoms. Scorned as Jews who sold their king, a majority of Scots rallied to the young king's standard, while they defiantly struggled to reclaim the honor of their Judaized national identity and Covenant. But it was the long years of exile that most strengthened the appeal of Jewish mysticism to royalist Scottish Masons, who linked their cause with ancient and contemporary Hebrews, who similarly lost their homeland and Temple.

In early spring 1649, Moray left France en route to Scotland, where he joined the household of his brother-in-law Balcarres.¹⁵⁴ During his secretive journey, he possibly visited Oxford or London, where Thomas Vaughan—a Welsh royalist and alchemist—was preparing a treatise on pacific Rosicrucianism. Because the connection between Moray and the Vaughans would prove important to Masonic developments, it will be useful to examine its possible origins. Vaughan and his twin brother Henry probably met Moray earlier, when all three were in the royalist camp in Oxford. In a 1641 poem written at Oxford, Henry Vaughan approved of Charles I's effort to unite Scottish and English royalists. The king's "kind Vertue" doth at once disclose,

The Beauty of their Thistle, and our Rose.
Thus You doe mingle Soules and firmly knitt
What were but joyn'd before; You Scots-men fitt
Closely with Us, and Reuniter prove,
You fetch'd the Crowne before, and now their Love.¹⁵⁵

As noted earlier, it was during Charles I's 1641 visit to Newcastle that Moray was initiated by Scottish Freemasons and that he was won over to the king's cause.

Five years later, Henry Vaughan was possibly privy to Moray's collaboration with Charles, when the king escaped in disguise from Oxford in order to join the Scottish army—a move that provoked

¹⁵⁴ R. Kerr, *Correspondence*, II, 1.

¹⁵⁵ Henry Vaughan, *The Works of Henry Vaughan*, ed. L.C. Martin (Oxford: Clarendon, 1914), II, 665.

the worried poet to write "The King Disguis'd" (1646). Even more than Cleveland in his similar poem, Henry suggested his awareness of the unusual secrecy, oaths, and "Cabalistic" mystery involved in the arrangements, as well as his distrust of the awaiting Scots:

A King and no King! Is he gone from us,
 And stolen into his Coffin thus?
 This was to ravish Death, and so prevent
 The Rebels treason and their punishment.

 Hence prophane Eyes! the mysterie's so deep,
 Like *Esdra*s books, the vulgar must not see't.

 These are our days of *Purim*, which oppress
 The Church, and force thee to the Wilderness.

 But I am vex'd, that we at all can guess
 This change, and trust great *Charles* to such a dress.

 Like some fair Church, which Zeal to charcoals burn'd,
 Or his own Court now to an Ale-house turn'd.

 Secrets of State are points we must not know;
 This vizard is thy privy Councel now.
 Thou Royal Riddle, and in every thing
 The true white Prince, our Hieroglyphic King!

 Be sure to look no Sanctuary there,
 Nor hope for safety in a Temple, where
 Buyers and Sellers trade: O strengthen not
 With too much trust the Treason of a Scot!¹⁵⁶

Aware of the arrears of pay owed to the Scottish army by the English Parliament, Henry Vaughan worried about the power of money to influence the negotiations with the king. As Moray would unhappily learn, the poet's fears proved prophetic. Henry did not publish "The King Disguis'd" until 1678, and there is no more evidence to suggest the brothers' access to Moray in the 1640's. From later documents, we know that Moray was influenced by Henry's Cabalistic meditation techniques and that he became a close friend and alchemical collaborator of Thomas.¹⁵⁷ Moreover, at some time

¹⁵⁶ Ibid., II, 605–06.

¹⁵⁷ Thomas Vaughan, *The Works of Thomas Vaughan*, ed. Alan Rudrum (Oxford: Clarendon, 1984), 7–10, 22–24.

before 1652 Moray established a contact between Thomas and Scottish students of Rosicrucianism.¹⁵⁸

Like his brother, Thomas Vaughan took up arms against Parliament and thus lost his church post in Wales circa 1648–49. He then determined to make a new career out of his chemical and medical interests. He moved into the Kensington residence of Thomas Henshaw, who recorded his return from Europe "a little before the King's murder," and the two collaborated in Hermetic experiments.¹⁵⁹ Henshaw claimed to possess J.B. van Helmont's formula for the alkahest, which the latter had given to Sir Hugh Platt during a visit to England.¹⁶⁰ With their intimate friend Ashmole, Henshaw and Vaughan began to move on the fringe of Hartlib's semi-clandestine network. Hartlib recorded the plan of Henshaw and Dr. Robert Child to "form a chemical club" and "to make all Philosophers acquainted with one another and to oblige them to mutual communications."¹⁶¹ He added that Child had visited Dr. Fludd, a kinsman of "Robert a Fluctibus," who owned many manuscripts of John Dee and other alchemists, and that Vaughan hints that he possesses "the Menstruum Universale."

Though Thomas Vaughan wrote *Anthroposophia Theomagia* in Oxford in 1648, he did not publish it until early 1650 and then under the pseudonym "Eugenius Philalethes." The publisher H. Blunden also published translations of Boehme, whom Vaughan believed was a member of the Rosicrucian fraternity.¹⁶² At this time, Thomas was already familiar with an English translation of the *Fama*, which he possibly received through Ashmole. In *Anthroposophia Theomagia*, he developed a royalist theosophy directed against sectarian division and rebellion ("for there is no Communion in Christendom"), and he addressed the "peaceable apostles" of the "Fratribus R.C.":

To the most illustrious and truly reborn Brothers of the Rosy Cross, of the first-born of the Church in this tumultuous age, and its peaceable apostles, good health from the center of health. Since the liberty of the high altar is allowed to the High Priest alone, this offering-cake may seem presumptuous . . . Those who approach unbidden may be

¹⁵⁸ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 101–02, 175.

¹⁵⁹ D. Dickson, *Tessera*, 186–91.

¹⁶⁰ Donald Dickson, "Thomas Henshaw and Sir Robert Paston's Pursuit of the Red Elixir," *Notes and Records of the Royal Society*, 51 (1997), 58.

¹⁶¹ Hartlib Papers, 28/1/68B, 71B. Ephemerides (1650).

¹⁶² T. Vaughan, *Works*, 128, 215, 626–30, 652.

considered insolent rather than obedient . . . I, most noble Brothers, am in the court-yard of the sanctuary . . . If there is anything in me of honey-making, I give you this honey-comb and beehive. Yet roses are usually spoiled on some people's breasts . . .¹⁶³

Thomas was familiar with Frizius's treatise, written by a Scottish Rosicrucian, and his own linking of temple, bee, and rose imagery suggests a merged Rosicrucian-Masonic message. Dickson suggests that when Thomas dedicated *Anthroposophia* to the "vere Renatis Fratribus R.C.," his reference to them as "reborn" could involve "the masonic activities then on the rise."¹⁶⁴ As noted earlier, Robert Fludd claimed that the Rosicrucians had gone underground and changed their name to "the Wise"—a move seen by some historians as an assimilation into Freemasonry.

Thomas reinforced his "Masonic" themes with references to the Divine Architect and the art of visualization. Drawing on Dionysius the Areopagite, Avicbron (Solomon ibn Gabirol), Reuchlin, Pistorius, Montano, and Fludd, Vaughan described God as a "wise Architect," who "sits in the Center of All, repaires the Ruines of his building, composeth all Disorders, and continues his Creature in his first, primitive Harmony." Man can imitate the Divine Architect through techniques of meditation:

That Meditation fore runns every Solemne Work, is a thing so well known to man, that he needs no further Demonstration of it then his own Practice: That there is also in God something Analogicall to it, from whence Man derived this Customary Notion of his . . . [Saith] the Spirit here to Esdras, then did I consider these things, He considered them first and made them afterwards. God in his Aeternall Idea, foresaw *That*, whereof as yet there was no *Materiall Copy* . . . And God the Holy Ghost is *Spiritus Opifex*, or the Agent, who fram'd the creature in a just *symmetrie* to his *Type*. This consideration or *type* God hath since used in the performance of inferiour works. Thus in the Institution of the Temple he commands Moses to the Mount, where the Divine Spirit shews him the *Idea* of the future *Fabrick*: And let them make me a Sanctuary that I may dwell amongst them according to all that I shew thee, after the pattern of the Tabernacle, and the pattern of all the Instruments thereof, even so shall you make it.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶³ Ibid., 597.

¹⁶⁴ D. Dickson, *Tessera*, 207.

¹⁶⁵ T. Vaughan, *Works*, 56, 57, 600–601.

Thomas Vaughan quickly followed his first book by publishing *Anima Magica Abscondita* (1650), in which he stressed again the concept of God as creator, architect, artificer. Man as maker imitates God when he externalizes the interior vision:

For let me suppose Hyliard with his Pencill, and Table ready to pour-tray a Rose: if he doth inwardly apprehend the very shape, and proportion of that which he intends to limne he may as well do it without his eyes, as without his Intellectuelle. Let us now apply this to the Spirit which worketh in Nature. This moves in the Centre of things, hath the matter before him . . . And first of all he exerciseth his chymistry; in severall Transmutations, producing Sinews, Veins, bloud, flesh, and bones: which work also includes his Arithmetick, for he makes the Joints and all Integrall parts . . . in a certain determinate Number; which may conduce to the beauty and motion of the Frame. Again in the outward Lineaments, or symmetrie of the compound, he proves himself a most regular Mathematician, proportioning Parts to Parts, all which Operations can proceede from Nothing but a Divine, Intellectuall spirit.¹⁶⁶

While Thomas expanded God's role to alchemist as well as architect, he also revealed His role as Cabalistic sexual generator in His divine marriage with the created world or *Shekinah*:

There is in every star, and in the Elementall world a certain principle which is *Uxor solis* [wife of sun]. These two [male and female potencies] in their Coition do emitere semen, which seed is carried in the womb of Nature: but the ejection of it, is perform'd invisibly, and in a Sacred silence; for this is the conjugall mystery of Heaven and Earth, their Act of Generation, a thing done in private between particular Males and Females, but how much more think you, between the two universall Natures?¹⁶⁷

Both Vaughan and Moray would maintain a sacramental sense of their earthly marriages, in which their wives shared their mystical interests. Moreover, they may have infused the Cabalistic secrets of visionary sex into the secret teachings of Rosicrucianism and Freemasonry.

That Thomas gained increasing access to Rosicrucian works is revealed by his oblique reference to Gerhard Dorn ("Sapiens"), whom the Rosicrucians considered a forerunner, and to the letter from a

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., 112-13.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., 120.

Rosicrucian in Dantzig sent to Fludd (published in *Summum Bonum*). He also hinted at the capacity of “any man” to ascend to the divine vision through the practice of ritualized meditation:

This is the pitch and place, to which if any man ascends, he enters into Chariots of Fire . . . and is translated from the earth, soul and body. Such was Enoch, such was Elijah, such was Esdras . . . This I suppose was R.C. the founder of a most Christian, and famous society, whose Body also by vertue of that Medicine he took in his life time, is preserv'd entire to this Day, with the Epitomes of two worlds about it. Such Elijahs are Members of this Fraternitie, who as their own writings testifie, walk in the supernatural light . . .¹⁶⁸

To defend the Rosicrucians' policy of invisibility, Thomas quoted Frizius: “in order to meet with us it is necessary that you see this light [white mist], for without this light it is impossible to see us, except when we wish.”¹⁶⁹ The capacity to function “invisibly”—i.e., to be recognized only by fellow initiates—was also an expertise of the Freemasons.

Was Thomas Vaughan an actual initiate of Freemasonry? Through his military service, he may have participated in a field lodge. Moreover, he had ties to the Mainwaring family, one of whose members was initiated with Ashmole. Henry Vaughan hinted at military service “neer Chester, 1645,” in the area where Colonel Mainwaring and Ashmole would become Masons some months later.¹⁷⁰ Though there is no evidence of the Vaughans' interest in the operative craft associated with architectural projects, they may have learned about the Cabalistic and Lullist traditions of Scottish Masonry from Moray, Ramsay, or Ashmole. In *Magia Adamica* (1650), Thomas added Lull to his list of great “illuminatees” and called him “a man who had been in the Center of Nature, and . . . understood a great part of the Divine Will.”¹⁷¹ Having studied Giorgio's *De Harmonia Mundi*, as well as Lull and Arnold de Villanova, Thomas was familiar with the Art of Memory, which he seemed to practice as a meditation technique. Perhaps he learned from Moray that the Lullist Art was considered a central “science” in Scottish Masonic training.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., 128–29.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., 717.

¹⁷⁰ H. Vaughan, *Works*, I, 49.

¹⁷¹ T. Vaughan, *Works*, 203, 207, 214, 602.

In Henry Vaughan's poetry there are further hints at an interest in speculative Masonic themes. From his rural retreat in Wales, Henry took on the title of "Silurist," a literary *nom de guerre* honoring an ancient Celtic warrior tribe. Calhoun notes that the name "Silurian" also designated one of the earliest documented Masonic lodges in South Wales.¹⁷² Having previously referred to secrets hidden from the profane, Henry now hinted at an embattled Temple that survives in a hidden, invisible form. In *Silex Scintillans*, a volume registered in March 1650, Henry included the poem "Jacobs Pillow, and Pillar," which included lines with suggestive Masonic resonance:

I see the Temple in thy Pillar rear'd,
And that dread glory, why thy children fear'd,
In mild clear visions, without a frown,
Unto thy solitary self is shown.
'Tis number makes a Schism: throngs are rude,
And God himself dyed by the multitude.
.....
Yea *Bethel* shall have Tithes (saith *Israels* stone)
And vows and visions, though her foes crye, None.
Thus is the solemn Temple sunk agen
Into a Pillar, and conceal'd from men.
And glory be to his eternal Name!
Who is contented, that this holy flame
Shall lodge in such a narrow pit, till he
With his strong arm turns our captivity.¹⁷³

While sketching this universalist Temple (now driven underground), Henry Vaughan also hinted at his practice of the architectural-Cabalistic visualization techniques of the Art of Memory:

The world's my Palace. I'll contemplate there,
And make my progress into ev'ry Sphere.
The Chambers of Air are mine; those three
Well furnish'd Stories my possession be.
I hold them all in Capite, and stand
Propt by my Fancy there.
.....
... Now my auspicious flight
Hath brought me to the Empyrean light.

¹⁷² Thomas Calhoun, *Henry Vaughan: The Achievement of "Silex Scintillans"* (Newark: Delaware UP, 1981), 40.

¹⁷³ H. Vaughan, *Works*, II, 528.

I am a sep'rate Essence, and can see
The Emanations of the Deitie . . .¹⁷⁴

We will return to Henry's visionary techniques when they emerge as an influence on Moray's practice in 1657—in a similar context of spiritual solace during political exile.

Henry's visualization experiments were evidently shared by his theosophical colleagues, as suggested by the writing of the Welsh royalist Thomas Powell, his "fellow prisoner," close friend, and publisher of *Silex Scintillans* (1651). In *Elementas Opticae* (1651), Powell discussed a wide variety of optical and visionary phenomena. Henry and Thomas Vaughan contributed dedicatory poems to Powell's treatise, which examined the issues of authentic, deceptive, and hallucinatory visionary experiences. While discussing optical illusions and spiritual visions, Powell drew on Dee's *Monas Hieroglyphica* and Preface to *Euclid*. From Henry Vaughan's poem, "The Stone," it seems that he and his friends experimented with crystal gazing, à la Dee:

But I (Alas!)
Was shown one day in a strange glass
That busie commerce kept between
God and his Creatures, though unseen.
They hear, see, speak,
And into loud discoveries break,
As loud as blood.¹⁷⁵

In Powell's treatise, *Quadriga Salutes* (1657), he stressed the importance not only of visualization but of catechizing in order to maintain the invisible Temple during times of oppression. Did he draw on the Masonic as well as Anglican tradition of ritualized question and answer in the training of apprentices and novitates? In his dedication to a pious but tolerant Anglican mother, he observed that "we build no Temples, but if we can contribute any thing towards the Temple of God to repair the ruins thereof, it is the highest point of our ambition and hope." Using "an Hieroglyphick or Emblem" from Du Bartas, he then argued that "catechizing is a very necessary expedient for the preservation of the Christian religion among us":

The Master-builders of Sion (who have spent much time in the pulpit, yet) because they have spent so little in foundation work, have

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., II, 615–16.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., II, 514.

found that they did but *aedificare in ruinam*, and that all their labour was but lost in building.

.....
This is the benefit and advantage of Catechistical exercises and of building up a Christian methodically, from the foundation upwards. Such an Edifice, being . . . an harmonious building; the super-structure being cemented to the foundation, and the roof and covering being adapted to the Super-structure, and all parts being framed and compacted according to the Rule of Proportion, is most like to last and bear up, and to prove storme-proof.

.....
As there are principles in all Sciences upon which the whole Art depends, and upon which it is built as upon a foundation: So in this Architectonical Science, and the Art of saving souls, there are certain principles which are of . . . moment and consequence.¹⁷⁶

Arguing the universality of all fundamental religious tenets, Powell also argued the brotherhood of man:

. . . the duty of man towards his Neighbour, obliging him to love him as himself, as his fellow-creature, hewn out of the same rock, made by the same hand, and bearing the same stamp impress and super-scription with him, even the image of him that made both, the one and the other.¹⁷⁷

The surprisingly modernist Masonic ring to his statements was reinforced by his description of the invisible Church, which "is not topical or confined to one place, but is Catholic or universal, both for times places and persons." Then, in a startling Rosicrucian allusion, Powell affirmed:

The Catholic Church here mentioned, it is not visible: for it is an object of our faith, not of our sight, and faith is of things not seen, *Heb.* II.1. This *Holy-Guild* society, *Fraternity of the Rosie-Cross* (as I may not unfitly term it) is invisible; for it is *Caetus praedestinatorum*, a company of men predestin'd to Salvation, whose names are written in the book of life, enroll'd in that sacred Register, among the Candidates of eternity.

Now who those are, and whose names are there registred, we are not allowed to know . . . God alone knoweth them that are his . . . There is *Judaeus in occulto* & *Judeaus in propatulo*.¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁶ [Thomas Powell], *Quadriga Salutes* (London: Sarah Griffin, 1657), B2.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 12.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 70–71.

Because Powell was so closely connected with the Vaughans during the 1640's and '50's, his Rosicrucian statement raises an additional question about Thomas Vaughan. Not only, was he a Freemason but was he an actual initiate of Rosicrucianism? In 1652, when Thomas prepared to publish a translation of the *Fama* that he acquired from Moray's Scottish circle, he affirmed "the Essence and Existence of that admired Chimaera, the Fraternitie of R.C."¹⁷⁹ But he also revealed that "I have for my own part no Relation to them, neither do I much desire their acquaintance." He believed that they kept themselves concealed in order to avoid mercenary appeals from would-be adepts who hoped to gain alchemical secrets. Nevertheless, in 1650 Henshaw, Vaughan, and six friends "put in practice a Model of Christian Learned Society," which included a laboratory and the production of Hermetic medicines, *gratis*, for their neighbors.¹⁸⁰ Despite their original non-sectarian plan, all the members were royalists, including at least two Catholics.

Hartlib, who was not a member, viewed their "Chymical Club" as an implementation of Andreae's ideas. Henshaw often visited Hartlib, ostensibly to discuss scientific experiments, but he may also have hoped to glean political intelligence for the royalist cause. Hartlib, in turn, sent extracts from his Continental correspondence to Cromwell's officials.¹⁸¹ While Thomas Vaughan lived communally with Henshaw's "club" or "college," he participated in Ashmole's circle, which included David Ramsay and his son William, Dr. Leven Fludd (nephew of Robert), Arthur Dee (son of John), and the mysterious William Backhouse, whom Ashmole considered his Hermetic "father." The mixture of Masonic and Rosicrucian interests in this network is suggestive, leading Dickson to conclude, "More than likely, the secret brotherhood with which Vaughan was associated was masonry, which was flourishing in Scotland and just then emerging in England."¹⁸²

In 1650, under the pseudonym James Hasolle, Ashmole published *Fasciculus Chemicus*, which featured his English translation of Arthur Dee's Latin treatise of 1629. Dee included an address to the Rosicrucian

¹⁷⁹ T. Vaughan, *Works*, 324–25, 480, 483.

¹⁸⁰ D. Dickson, *Tessera*, 190–95.

¹⁸¹ W.J. Hitchens, Adam Matuszewski, and John Young, eds., *The Letters of Jan Jonston to Samuel Hartlib* (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo, 2000), 23.

¹⁸² D. Dickson, *Tessera*, 212.

fraternity, and Ashmole featured an elaborate emblematic frontispiece with alchemical, astrological, and what Josten calls "well-known masonic symbols."¹⁸³ Ashmole wrote Arthur Dee about his admiration for his father's *Monas Hieroglyphica*, and he revealed his awareness of John Dee's unpublished diary, with its accounts of angelic conversations. Like Henry Vaughan, Ashmole attempted "skrying" over a crystal or stone, and he recorded a poem given to him by a medium in a trance state. At this time, Ashmole was worried about Cromwell's march into Scotland and about increasing surveillance on royalists in London. He may have hoped to gain political information or "second sight" through his visionary experiments.

In December 1650 Ashmole referred to his reading of Lullist, Cabalistic, and Rosicrucian books in the libraries of Fludd, Backhouse, and the currently imprisoned Ramsay. As a known royalist, Ashmole could not help his friend Ramsay, so the latter called on Dury to use his influence with Parliament to win his release. In 1651 Ramsay gave Dury a French recipe for dying scarlet, which his uncle was to translate into English and publish anonymously—thus gaining funds to win Ramsay's liberation. A worried Dury undertook the favor but stressed to Hartlib the necessity for absolute secrecy, in order to protect his new position as keeper of the former Royal Library.¹⁸⁴

In the same year, Ashmole referred to his "adoption" by William Backhouse, who enacted the Hermetic ritual of choosing one son to receive the father's alchemical secrets.¹⁸⁵ Backhouse's real father Samuel had contacts with the court of James I, where he persuaded Drebbel to translate a mysterious alchemical manuscript. Young William moved in the circle of the First Duke of Buckingham, and he shared the mechanical interests of Drebbel and Ramsay. He subsequently travelled on the Continent, where he contacted Rosicrucian activists before retiring to a quiet life at Swallowfield. There he pursued his interests in alchemy and architecture, which he saw as increasingly threatened by the Civil War. An admirer of the plans of Laud and Jones to reconstruct St. Paul's, Backhouse was a generous contributor to the building fund, and he made an architectural pilgrimage every summer to study cathedrals, abbeys, and castles.

¹⁸³ E. Ashmole, *Autobiographical Notes*, II, 525–26.

¹⁸⁴ Hartlib Papers, 28/2/12B. Ephemerides, part 2 (ca. April 1651).

¹⁸⁵ C.H. Josten, "William Backhouse of Swallowfield," *Ambix*, 4 (1949), 1–34.

A practitioner of Vitruvian theories, Backhouse included “an ancient symbol of Masonry” (a triangle with Hebrew letters in each corner) in his translation of an alchemical treatise.

That Ashmole, who was both a Freemason and student of Rosicrucianism, revered his Hermetic “father” is suggestive, for Backhouse may have had contacts with Scottish participants in both movements. Backhouse’s first Rosicrucian-style composition was written in 1633, the same year when the First Earl of Balcarres copied Kerr’s translation of the *Fama* and *Confessio*. In April 1651 Backhouse introduced Ashmole to “Lord Ruthin, who was a most ingenious person.” Though some scholars identify the lord as Sir Thomas Ruthven, Josten expresses his doubts; more likely, Ashmole’s new friend was Patrick Ruthven, the Scottish alchemist, who had practised Hermetic medicine in London since his release from prison in 1624.¹⁸⁶ It was widely rumored that William Ruthven, his brother, had achieved the philosopher’s stone, and Patrick’s alchemical notebook revealed his own expertise in the art. Read points out that Ashmole’s description of “the manifold virtues of the Philosopher’s Stone,” published in *Theatrum Chemicum Britannicum* (1652), is strikingly similar to that in a manuscript written by Patrick Ruthven, who had copied these “virtues” from Daniel Müller’s letter to the Earl of Argyll in 1629.¹⁸⁷

In the *Theatrum Chemicum*, Ashmole shared many of the concerns of royalist Rosicrucians and Freemasons in Scotland, and it was fitting that Ancram acquired his new work.¹⁸⁸ Ashmole lamented the destruction of great ecclesiastical buildings by radical Reformers, who also burned manuscripts and books deemed “Popish or Diabolical” because they included mathematical or geometrical diagrams.¹⁸⁹ He quoted Norton on the usefulness of alchemical and astrological studies to “Free Masons” and builders. Noting the affinities between the theories of Lull and Ripley, he stressed the latter’s visit to the “Knights of Saint John of Jerusalem” at Rhodes and affirmed that records of Ripley’s alchemical donations to the Hospitallers are still preserved at Malta. Like the original Rosicrucians, current practitioners of Hermetic healing in England work secretly and seek no profit, though their services would receive great praise in other countries. As an

¹⁸⁶ Patrick Ruthven died in 1652. See G. Burnet, *History*, I, 27n.1.

¹⁸⁷ J. Read, “Scottish Alchemy,” 146–48.

¹⁸⁸ Kerr’s library.

¹⁸⁹ E. Ashmole, *Theatrum Chemicum*, A2, 7, 444–58, 462.

example of foreign appreciation for Rosicrucian-style medical practitioners, Ashmole cited the royal patronage given to Dr. William Davison, the Scottish physician in Paris, who understands the "secret Harmony and Relation" between man and cosmos.

At this time, another Scottish Freemason with Rosicrucian interests was in London. In 1652 Dr. William Maxwell (Frizius?), member of the Edinburgh lodge and friend of Moray, gave a collection of manuscripts on Hermetic medicine, metallurgy, and alchemy to Joseph Hall, former Bishop of Norwich.¹⁹⁰ A favorite of James I, Hall had supported the king's Solomonic pacification and architectural policies. In 1643 he was heart-broken by the desecration of Norwich cathedral by parliamentary troops:

It is no other than tragical to relate the carriage of that furious sacrilege whereof our eyes and ears were the sad witnesses . . . Lord, what work was here! what clattering of glasses! what beating down of walls! what tearing up of monuments! . . . what demolishing of curious stonework, that had not any representation in the world but only of the cost of the founder and skill of the mason!¹⁹¹

Hall further described the destruction of the splendid Ashby Castle in his birth-place, which was blown up by parliamentary engineers. He may have found comfort in Dr. Maxwell's manuscripts, which were replete with optimistic and constructive methods of bringing good out of evil, gold out of dross, medicine out of dung. Long a student of ritualized meditation, Hall's current writings—*The Invisible World Discovered to Spiritual Eyes* (1651) and *The Holy Order, or Fraternity of the Mourners of Sion* (1653)—suggest that he shared Hermetic and Masonic interests with Maxwell.

The probable presence of two Scottish alchemists, Ruthven and Maxwell, in London in 1651–52 throws new light on Thomas Vaughan's contemporary collaboration with Scottish Rosicrucians. When "Eugenius Philalethes" published *The Fame and Confession of the Fraternity of R.C., Commonly of the Rosie Cross* in 1652, he hinted at his contact with "some Gentlemen besides my self" who possessed translations of the *Fama* but who allowed him to publish the text he had received from "an unknown hand."¹⁹² Willard and McLean argue

¹⁹⁰ British Library, Sloane MS.3505.f.218–39.

¹⁹¹ Frank L. Huntley, *Bishop Joseph Hall, 1574–1656* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1979), 138.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, 479.

that this text came from Moray in Scotland, for it duplicates (with a few word-changes) that of the First Earl of Balcarres, Moray's late father-in-law.¹⁹³ Could Ruthven or Maxwell have served as the London intermediary in this transaction? That Lauderdale, who was then working closely with Moray and the Second Earl of Balcarres, acquired Vaughan's edition of *The Fame and Confession* reinforces the Scottish connection.¹⁹⁴ Lauderdale amassed a huge collection of rare Rosicrucian-style literature, including the complete works of Fludd, and he was almost certainly a Mason.

While the clandestine network of Freemasons and would-be Rosicrucians functioned cautiously in England, their associates in Scotland were involved in active battle against Cromwell. On 5 February 1649 the Scottish Parliament declared Charles II the lawful successor to his father. Hutton explains that the regicide had offended the two fundamental impulses of the Covenanting movement: "the religious by breaching the Covenant of 1638, and the patriotic by killing a King of Scots without reference to the views of the Scottish nation."¹⁹⁵ However, the extremist "kirk party," which was still in power, worried that the disasters which had overcome Scotland were punishment for some national sin. In August questions were raised in the general assembly of the Church of Scotland about the Mason Word, with a few members suggesting that it was "something sinister."¹⁹⁶ When other members supported the Freemasons, the assembly did not condemn the Mason Word but instead instructed the local Presbyteries to send in their opinions about it (no record of their responses survives). However, it is significant that at a time of renewed overtures by Charles II—a "Mason King"—to the Scots, the existence and function of the Mason Word should become a matter of religious and political debate.

During this period, Charles II may have arranged for an English agent, Sir John Denham, to receive the Mason Word. Denham, who had earlier performed military service for the royalist court at Oxford, collaborated with Cowley in the code-work of the secret correspon-

¹⁹³ Thomas Willard, "The Rosicrucian Manifestoes in Britain," *Publications of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 77 (1983), 489–95; A. McLean, "Manuscript Sources."

¹⁹⁴ John Maitland, Duke of Lauderdale, *Bibliotheca Selectissima* (London, 1687), 15.

¹⁹⁵ Ronald Hutton, *Charles II* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989), 37.

¹⁹⁶ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 127.

dence.¹⁹⁷ Since then, he acted as a liaison with Scottish royalists, and he undertook a secret mission to Scotland from September 1648 to early 1649. On his return to Paris, Henrietta Maria conferred with him in May; she then sent instructions that Charles II and his council must provide Denham with a certain "credence" to enable him to deal with the Scots.¹⁹⁸ Denham became the confidential friend of Sir William Murray, now Earl of Dysart, and Sir Alexander Fraser, the king's Scottish physician, who was also a Mason (according to an eighteenth-century document), and he was made privy to their secret services to the cause.¹⁹⁹

The king promised Denham the reversion of the office of Surveyor of Works in England, in the event of the death of Inigo Jones. John Webb later conceded that the poet had "some knowledge of the theory of architecture," but the appointment probably had a political purpose, for it was made just before the king sent Denham to Poland on a mission to raise money from royalist Scots in Polish service.²⁰⁰ Perhaps Masonic affiliation would help him identify and secure loyal Scots, as well as maintain secrecy in the face of the Commonwealth spies who tracked his efforts. As we shall see, Denham probably utilized Masonic networks in the later 1650's, when he worked clandestinely for the Restoration. According to Anderson, in 1660 Denham was appointed Deputy Grand Master by the new Grand Master, Sir Henry Jermyn, who had supervised his and Cowley's intelligence work during the Interregnum.²⁰¹

In March 1650, while Denham was in Poland, Charles II invited Lothian and other representatives of the Covenanters to meet with him at Breda, where they worked out a torturous and deceptive treaty of alliance which enabled Charles to sail for Scotland. He reluctantly and insincerely signed both Covenants, which allowed the commissioners to joyously inform the Parliament in Edinburgh that Scotland at last had "a Covenanted King" to lead "the Chosen People." Among the king's entourage, the only Englishman trusted by Argyll and the Covenanters was George Villiers, Second Duke

¹⁹⁷ See J. Denham, *Works*, 13-18, 60, 108.

¹⁹⁸ Henrietta Maria, *Letters*, 364.

¹⁹⁹ According to Baron Johan Starck, who mistakenly cites him as "Eduard" Frazer; see W. Zimmerman, *Von der alten*, 375.

²⁰⁰ J. Denham, *Works*, 105-11.

²⁰¹ J. Anderson, *Constitutions (1738)*, 101.

of Buckingham, who sympathized with Presbyterian concerns while maintaining his loyalty to the king.²⁰² Despite the rigid controls of the kirk, Buckingham became popular in Scotland and managed to raise an army of English royalists resident in the country.²⁰³ While he worked with Lauderdale, Balcarres, and Moray, Buckingham was evidently initiated into Freemasonry. According to Anderson, after the Restoration Buckingham was known as “an old Mason,” who subsequently served as Grand Master in 1674–79.²⁰⁴

On 1 January 1651 at Scone, the king’s former opponent Argyll placed the crown of Scotland on Charles II’s head, while Lothian and his sons participated in the ceremony.²⁰⁵ Joyous crowds flew banners inscribed “King and Covenant.” However, the Scots were still fatally divided over religious issues, and the expulsion of royalists from the Scottish army weakened their prospects for the campaign against England. Among the Scots most trusted by the king were Moray (who resigned his French commission to return to Stuart service), Balcarres, Dunfermline, and Lauderdale—all apparently possessors of the Mason Word. Charles elevated Balcarres to an earldom and made him hereditary governor of Edinburgh Castle; he made Moray Justice Clerk and then Lord of Session; he relied on Lauderdale for military advice. Despite Charles’s earlier suspicion about Lothian, the Scottish royalists now entrusted him with dispatches to Sweden, where Queen Christina secretly arranged for arms to be sent from Gothenburg to Stuart forces.

Disastrously, when the king led the Scottish army south into England, Argyll and the radical Covenanters refused to participate. The crushing defeat inflicted by Cromwell’s English troops at Worcester on 3 September 1651 demolished not only the hopes of the clerical radicals but destroyed the independence of Scotland.²⁰⁶ After successfully assisting the king’s escape, Lauderdale was captured and committed to prison in England for the next nine years. While Cromwell’s agent General George Monk expanded English military control over Scotland, Moray managed to escape to the Highlands,

²⁰² W. Mackenzie, *Maitland*, 180–81.

²⁰³ Christine Phipps, *Buckingham: Public and Private Man* (New York: Garland, 1985), 5–6.

²⁰⁴ J. Anderson, *Constitutions (1738)*, 105.

²⁰⁵ R. Kerr, *Correspondence*, I, xcvi; II, 311.

²⁰⁶ W. Mackenzie, *Maitland*, 189.

where he continued to organize resistance. In October Buckingham arrived safely in Rotterdam, where he began making new plans for Scottish initiatives. His advice to Charles II to "walk intirely in the same steps of presbytery as formerly" was scorned by Sir Edward Nicholas, a leader of the English royalist faction, who continued to distrust all the Scottish agents.²⁰⁷

Meanwhile, in the northern kingdom, Balcarres was forced to disband his regiment in December 1651. Despite the military occupation of their country, the Scottish royalists managed to stay in touch with each other, with the Stuart court in Paris, and with William Murray's residence in Antwerp. From Moray's later correspondence, it seems likely that Masonic techniques of oral communication, secret signs and gestures, invisible inks, and "hieroglyphic" codes played a role in this clandestine communication network.²⁰⁸ As Moray, Balcarres, and their co-conspirators met in Edinburgh, they also hoped for assistance through extra-sensory perception. The second-sighted Highlander had proved accurate in his prophecy to General Middleton about Charles I's execution.²⁰⁹ Was he also accurate in predicting several failed attempts before Charles II would be restored? Through the proper utilization of "precognition," the royalists might avoid such catastrophes.

Thus, the employment in Moray's household of a second-sighted woman was not just for domestic purposes. Unfortunately, the seeress predicted on 25 December 1652 that the joy of Moray, his pregnant wife Sophia, and their Christmas party would soon be turned to grief. When Sophia went into a difficult labor on 2 January, Moray was at her side, "exhorting her cheerfully to endure these moments of pain, which would soon be changed to everlasting pleasure." After she and the baby died, they were privately buried at Balcarres in the Gothic chapel constructed by her father, the "Rosicrucian" earl. Throughout this ordeal, Moray displayed the kind of mystical stoicism that later served him well in exile—and which he infused into his Masonic philosophy. He also maintained a fascination with second-sight and its relevance to the Stuart cause.

While the royalists secretly plotted the rebellion later known as Glencairn's Rising, General Monk undertook a policy of building

²⁰⁷ C. Phipps, *Buckingham*, 6.

²⁰⁸ A. Robertson, *Moray*, 77–81.

²⁰⁹ J. Aubrey, *Miscellanies*, 79.

massive stone fortresses at strategic locations in Scotland. Designed to house the English troops of occupation, they became the major building project in Scotland over the next seven years.²¹⁰ Monk was interested in domestic as well as military architecture, and he reportedly became curious about the role of Freemasonry in Scottish affairs.²¹¹ According to a 1745 Masonic document, the “Antient Lodge of Dundee” was raided by Monk’s troops in September 1651, when “all the rights and charters of this Lodge, with many other valuable things were lost and destroyed.”²¹² Dundee—and presumably its lodge—was a stronghold of royalist and Episcopalian sympathizers, and Monk could have learned from the confiscated lodge records about the political role played by Masonic networks in the opposition to Cromwell.

Despite widespread resentment at the English occupation, many Scottish craftsmen acquiesced to their conquerors and accepted employment in order to feed their families. John Mylne, the former royal master mason, remained personally loyal to the king but he was also a strong Presbyterian and sincere Covenanter. Thus he helped Monk design and construct several of the citadels. However, Monk also decided to import large numbers of “artificers” from England, and their destructive as well as constructive activities fueled Scottish patriotic hostility. Evoking memories of earlier English invasions, Monk’s masons razed and stripped “their best hewn stone” from cathedrals, chapels, abbeys, and bishops’ castles in order to build the English forts. It was perhaps antagonism between local and foreign masons that led to the use of separate working parties at Inverness, where the southeast side of the citadel was built by English masons and the northeast side by Scottish masons.²¹³

As noted earlier, except for Jones’s projects for the Stuart kings, England did not have a strong post-Reformation tradition of designing and working in “hewn stone.” When Jones died in 1652, it was rumored (and later confirmed by Christopher Wren) that he confessed his Catholic belief. This fueled further distrust of his former colleagues and workmen by the Parliament in London. Thus, Monk

²¹⁰ C.H. Firth, *Scotland and the Protectorate* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1899), xlv–lii.

²¹¹ According to Andrew Michael Ramsay’s account in 1741; see A.F. von Büsching, *Beiträge zu der Lebensgeschichte Denkwürdiger Personen* (Halle, 1783–89), III, 319–38.

²¹² D. Lyon, *History*, 235.

²¹³ C. Firth, *Scotland*, xlv.

also imported engineers and masons from the Continent. Among them was Hans Ewald Tessin, a professional military architect, who came from Sweden's German-speaking territories in Pomerania.²¹⁴ In 1652 Tessin was initiated in the Edinburgh lodge, thus becoming the first *documented* foreign Freemason. That Tessin worked with Mylne would later be significant for Masonic developments in the eighteenth-century, when the Tessin family played a leading role in the revival of *Écossais* Freemasonry in Sweden.

The uneasy alliance between Monk, an English Presbyterian, and local ministers of the kirk was paralleled by the uneasy relationship of Freemasonry and the contemporary Scottish church. In early 1652, when James Ainslie's candidacy for the ministry was evaluated, certain elders of the kirk revealed that Ainslie had the Mason Word and thus might be ineligible for the position. The Kelso Presbytery replied:

... that to their judgment ther is neither sinne nor scandale in that word because in the purest tymes of this kirke maisons haveing that word have been ministers, that maisons and men having that word have been and daylie are elders in our sessions, and many professors haveing that word are daylie admitted to the ordinances.²¹⁵

The historical resonance to this statement—implying a relationship between Masonry and the early Reformation church as well as the Covenanting church—reinforces the sense that Freemasonry in Scotland was long associated with nationalist identification. Moreover, young non-operatives like Ainslie were still joining lodges, which looked suspicious to "Cromwellian" kirkmen.

That the Mason Word had become more widely known—and more controversial—was further revealed in 1652–53 in the bizarre patriotic manifesto issued by Sir Thomas Urquhart of Cromarty, who was currently in prison in London. A staunch royalist who had been knighted by Charles I, Urquhart despised the fanatical Presbyterians whose bigotry and ignorance brought such grief to Scotland. A great admirer of the mathematician John Napier and the alchemist

²¹⁴ Stevenson speculated that Tessin was Dutch; see *Origins*, 198. However, he actually came from Swedish Pomerania; see A.A. Tait, "The Protectorate Citadels of Scotland," *AH*, 8 (1965), 12–15, 17n.54. For the connection of the Tessin family with military architecture and the Swedish army, see Georg Tessin, *Die Deutschen Regimenter der Krone Schweden* (Köln, 1965), *passim*.

²¹⁵ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 127–28.

William Davison, Urquhart shared their eclectic interests in mathematics, mechanics, and chemistry, which he investigated further during travels in France, Spain, and Italy. After fighting for Charles II at Worcester, Urquhart was captured by Cromwell's troops, who also scattered through the streets the thousands of pages of manuscripts that he carried in his trunk. In a quixotic effort to gain release from prison, Urquhart wrote and published in London *Logopandectision: or, the Discovery of A Most Exquisite Jewel . . . Serving in this place, To frontal a Vindication of the Honour of Scotland, from that Infamy, whereinto the Rigid Presbyterian Party of that Nation, out of their Covetousness and ambition, most dissembledly hath involved it* (1652).

Urquhart claimed to have invented a universal language (the "jewel") that would be of such value to Britain that he should be released in order to develop it. From his comparison of this "logical linguistic framework" to architectural-surveying processes, it is clear that he drew on the Art of Memory:

. . . for better understanding whereof with all its dependant boughs, sprigs, and maelets I have before my lexicon set down the division thereof, making use of another allegory, into so many cities which are subdivided into streets, they againe into lanes, those into houses, these into stories whereof each room standeth for a word; and all these so methodically, that who observeth my precepts thereanent shall at the first hearing of a word know to what city it belongeth and consequently not be ignorant of some general signification thereof, till, after a most exact prying into all its letters, finding the street, lane, house, story and room thereby detonated, he punctually hit upon the very proper thing it represents in its most specifical signification.²¹⁶

As proof of the power of "this mnemoneutick [memory-aiding] hexameter," Urquhart recounted the sensational exploits of his hero, the Admirable Crichton, who was only one of the hundreds of learned and courageous Scots he praised for their scholarly and military exploits.

Well versed in Jewish and Lullist writings, which furnished materials for his new language, Urquhart lamented the depressing effect on Scottish intellectual life of the mercenary radicals, whom he called the "most rigidly Israelitizing . . . in their synagogical Sanhedrin." In order to redeem the true Judaic-Egyptian heritage of his own ances-

²¹⁶ Thomas Urquhart, *The Jewel*, ed. R.D.S. Jackson and R.J. Lyall (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1983), 73.

tors and his native country, he offered to "undertake a pilgrimage to old Judea, visit the ruines of Jerusalem and trace the foot-steps of Zedekiah's fellow captives to the gates of Babylon." Calling for greater intellectual freedom and religious tolerance, Urquhart then made a provocative reference to the Mason Word:

I saw once a young man who, for his cunning conversance in the feats of Leger Demaine, was branded by some of that fry for sorcery; and another for being able, by vertue of the masson word, to make a masson whom he had never seene before, without speaking or any apparent signe, come and salute him, reputed by many of the same litter to have had a familiar; their grosse ignorance moving them to call that supernaturall or above the naturall reach of meere man, whereof they knew not the cause.

By which meanes, mathematicall thaumaturgies, opticall magick, secrets of nature and other philosophicall mysteries, being esteemed to be rancke witchcraft, they ruine the best part of learning and make their own unskillfulnes supreame judge to pass an irrevocable sentence upon the condemnation of learning.²¹⁷

Urquhart especially appealed to his countryman John Dury for support in his petition, and it was perhaps Dury's influence that led the author to omit the section (#38–49) on the Mason Word and Presbyterian bigotry from the 1652 edition. After all, Dury had just taken some risk in aiding the release of David Ramsay, a Scottish Mason, who was still viewed with suspicion by Dury's parliamentary employers. It is possible that a subsequent publication, with many Masonic themes, by William Ramsay encouraged Urquhart to reinstate the Mason Word section in the 1653 edition of *The Jewel*.

In *Astrologia Restaurata* (1653), initially composed in 1651 while his father David was still in prison, William Ramsay paralleled Urquhart's claim for the Egyptian origins of his family. Though his mother was English, William wished to honor his father's Scottish descent by changing the spelling to "Ramesey," as in the pharaoh Rameses: "The Original of our Name was from the Residence of his and my Progenitors in the Land of *Egypt* . . . in that County which was called *Goshen*."²¹⁸ Despite the current detractors who scorn his father as a mere watch-maker, two Stuart kings and a crown prince recognized his great talents and made him "Page of the Bed-chamber and

²¹⁷ Ibid., 249.

²¹⁸ William Ramesay, *Astrologia Restaurata* (London: Robert White, 1653), 28–29.

Groom of the Privy Chamber.” The libellous critic who claimed that David Ramsay was imprisoned because he cheated Charles I out of great sums through his alchemical experiments was wrong, “for there is none who had any acquaintance with the King, but can acquaint the world, he was ever averse to such a belief, and had many times dissuaded him from such expensive courses (this truly is a pretty world when such fellows as he shall speak of kings actions and expectations).” Among witnesses to his father’s financial probity, William named Sir David Cunningham, who had earlier organized a “noble fraternitie” at Charles I’s court and whose family had Masonic connections in Scotland. It is possible that William, like his father, also became a Mason while attending college in Edinburgh.

In *Astrologia Restaurata* (London, 1653), William Ramesey suggested his familiarity with Masonic and Rosicrucian lore. Drawing upon the traditions of Solomon, David, and Hermes Trismegistus, he outlined the important scientific and mathematical uses of astrology. Echoing Masonic tradition, he argued that the science of astrology was taught by Abraham to the Egyptians and that Seth preserved it in the two pillars (of marble and brick). From his father’s (and his own?) familiarity with Freemasonry, William probably knew that the sciences of geometry and masonry were also preserved in the pillars. Even today, he argued, astrology is necessary to the proper building of houses, castles, cities, and churches, especially when laying the foundation stone. Unfortunately, “we shall find this election (since in this our age we build more *Serraios* than *Churches*) to be in a manner useless.”²¹⁹ Like Urquhart, William determined to reclaim the honor of Scotland in the face of English mockery, and he advocated tolerance towards all “true-hearted and honest” men of every nation. From a later publication, it is clear that William Ramesey included not only his “brethren the Astrologers” but “all the Brethren of the Rosy Cross” in his universalist fraternity.²²⁰

In 1653 in London, when Urquhart published his defense of the Mason Word, another alleged Mason arrived in London. Hartlib noted that John Denham, the talented poet, was lodging at the Savoy and that he was “a Mighty ingenious man for all manners of water-

²¹⁹ Ibid., 142–45.

²²⁰ William Ramesey, *De Venenis* (London: Samuel Speed, 1663), dedication to Charles II, dated 26 October 1660.

works and other ingenuities."²²¹ His further description of Denham as "a great mechanicall traveller" suggests Denham's use of a "masonic" or technological cover for his intelligence work. At the same time, Denham's friend Moray was possibly using the Mason Word in Scotland to identify and link together supporters for the projected rising. In the spring, Moray sent to Charles II in Paris a "Declaration" that explained the aims and methods of organization for the campaign. Robertson notes that Moray "refers to a bond of union and demonstrates its utility, for it is intended to secure mutual aid and protection by the different parts of the country."²²² This document was almost certainly the "Declaration of the Inhabitants of Hill Countreys of this Kingdom of Scotland," which utilized Rosicrucian-style language to appeal for God's help in the king's restoration.²²³ Thus, the Scots must repent until Jehovah "be pleased to returne to us with healing under his wings . . . to build again oure Jerusalem upon its oune heepe—to restore to us the light of our eyes and our crowne." After the king received it, the declaration was sent to Balcarres.

Despite the intense efforts of Moray and his allies to maintain secrecy, some of their letters were intercepted and there were undoubtedly spies in their midst. On 26 November the Cromwellian journal *Mercurius Politicus* reported in London that "in order to heighten and inflame the people, they [the royalists] give out that Balcarres and Sir Robert Moray are gone to fetch their King to them."²²⁴ However, jealousies among the Highland and Lowland leaders, compounded by the hostility of English royalists to the Scots, undermined the effectiveness of Moray's strategy. Then, in December, forged letters accused Moray of plotting the assassination of the king. A later Italian friend of Moray claimed that the English courtier Edward Hyde (Clarendon) and "others among his enemies" accused him of "sorcery, and of being against the King."²²⁵

²²¹ Hartlib Papers: 28/2/72B. Ephemerides, part 4 (September–December 1653).

²²² A. Robertson, *Moray*, 84–85.

²²³ James Maidment, *Historical Fragments, Relative to Scottish Affairs, from 1635 to 1664* (Edinburgh: Thomas Stevenson, 1833), 26, 42.

²²⁴ *Ibid.*, 89.

²²⁵ W.E. Knowles, ed., *Lorenzo Magalotti at the Court of Charles II: His "Relazione d'Inghilterra" of 1668* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier UP, 1980), 46–47. Magalotti refers to Hyde, who was Earl of Clarendon and the "Chancellor" at the time of his visit. See also G. Burnet, *History*, I, 106.

Moray was arrested and imprisoned in Edinburgh, from where he wrote to Charles and affirmed his loyalty. In two surviving letters, Moray used suggestive Masonic terms. First, he stressed his loyalty by saying, "I am so absolutely disposed to obey Your Majesties commands that I take them for the compass animated from above, wherby my poor actings in Your Majesties service ought to be directed."²²⁶ Then, confident that an investigation would prove his innocence, he concluded, "And then having found me guiltless, your Majesty may, as a Master Builder doth with his materials . . . most sovereignly dispose of and determine [my fate]." Moray included his Mason's Mark in the text of this letter, probably as a further reminder to the king of their fraternal bonds.²²⁷

Moray's innocence was soon proved to the king and, on his release from prison, he resumed his secret effort to organize the rising. When General Monk successfully crushed the rebellion in September 1654, he was determined to capture and severely punish Moray and his companion Middleton. Had Monk penetrated the royalists' Masonic network? If so, later claims that he joined the fraternity and used a similar Masonic network in 1659 to organize the Restoration become more plausible.²²⁸ Despite Monk's search parties in the Highlands, Moray and Middleton managed to escape and arrived in Paris by April 1655. There Moray joined Balcarres and his wife at St. Germain in what became an economically difficult but intellectually productive exile. The Scots established links by correspondence and visits between their Masonic brethren, who endured imprisonment in London and banishment in various cities on the Continent.

According to French tradition, Stuart partisans maintained their Masonic lodge at St. Germain. Moray may have learned that his former colleague Montereul, who was made a burgess in Edinburgh before returning to France, utilized St. Germain in 1650 during the turbulent days of the *Fronde*.²²⁹ From a contemporary description of Montereul's clandestine activities, the diplomat seemed to employ

²²⁶ D. Stevenson, "Masonry," 419.

²²⁷ National Library of Scotland: Balcarres Papers, MS.29.f.243 (Robert Moray to Charles II).

²²⁸ See A.F. von Büsching, *Beiträge*, III, 319–38.

²²⁹ On events at St. Germain, see Orest Ranum, *The Fronde: A French Revolution, 1648–1652* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1993), 209–13, 326.

some of the tactics of Scottish Freemasonry in order to build support for the imprisoned Bourbon princes of Condé and Conti:

He communicated with them almost daily by means of an invisible ink, the secret of which he learned from Charles I. . . . During the imprisonment of the princes he rallied around him, by his zeal and activity, all their followers in Paris, so far as to form a secret association [*un corps invisible*], more to be dreaded in affairs of such a nature than an openly hostile force [*plus à redouter que des bataillons*].²³⁰

The untimely death of Montereul in April 1651 meant that little more is known of his secret association, but the activities of various craftsmen's fraternities during the *Fronde* possibly provoked official suspicion about the *compagnonnage*, which emerged from the shadows into a harsh public spotlight four years later.

In March 1655 the Doctors of Theology at the Sorbonne issued a condemnation of the *compagnonnage*, whose allegedly blasphemous rituals bore a striking resemblance to those of the Scottish Freemasons. The "pretended" duty (*dévoir*) of a Companion consists of three promises—to honor God, preserve the good of the master, and maintain their brothers.²³¹ According to the theologians, they actually profane the mysteries of our religion. They have among themselves a jurisdiction in which they elect officers, who keep a correspondence between towns by a watch-word (*mot du guet*). They make an offensive league against apprentices of their craft who do not join their "cabale." They swear to never reveal to outsiders their secrets, and they choose certain taverns where they use two rooms, one to hold festivities and the other to perform secret initiations into the "traditions diaboliques" of their craft. Despite this and subsequent interdictions, the *compagnonnage* carried on a clandestine existence in Paris and the provinces. However, not until the eighteenth-century was there any documented linkage of their history and political cause with those of the Stuart Freemasons.

While Cromwell assumed the role of Lord Protector over England and Scotland, Moray and Balcarres served Charles II in Paris and then followed the court as it moved from city to city in Germany

²³⁰ Montereul, *Correspondence*, I, xxv; Cardinal de Retz, *Mémoires*, ed. Aimé Champollion-Figeac (Paris: Charpentier, 1873), II, 278.

²³¹ Emile Coornaert, *Les Compagnonnages en France du Moyen Age à Nos Jours* (Paris: Les Éditions Ouvrières, 1966), 113–117.

and Belgium, before settling in Holland. During these years of exile, Moray developed the Hermetic and Cabalistic skills that eventually won him reknown as “a great patron of the Rosicrucians.”²³² At the same time, he undertook a remarkable correspondence with a fellow Scottish Mason in which he developed the illuminist themes that would emerge so powerfully in the *Rose-Croix* Masonic degrees utilized by Jacobite exiles in the eighteenth-century.

²³² According to Anthony à Wood; see A. Robertson, *Moray*, 187.

CHAPTER NINE

THE THEATRE OF HIEROGLYPHICS: MASONS AND JEWS BEHIND THE SCENES OF THE RESTORATION (1655–1664)

When the Sanctuary was destroyed and the Temple was burnt and the people driven into exile, the Shekinah left her home in order to accompany them into captivity . . . The Holy One . . . will then rebuild the Temple first, restore the Holy of Holies, build the city of Jerusalem and then raise her from the dust. So the Scripture says: "The Lord doth build up Jerusalem" first, and then, "He gathereth together the dispersed of Israel."

—*The Zohar*, 134a

After the Wars were over, and the Royal Family restor'd, true Masonry was likewise restor'd . . . besides the Traditions of old Masons now alive, which may be rely'd on, we have much reason to believe that King Charles II was an Accepted Free Mason . . .

—James Anderson, *Constitutions of the Freemasons* (1723)

Though little is known about Moray's activities during the two years of Charles II's wanderings in Germany and Belgium, it was during this period that he came into contact with multi-national students of Rosicrucianism, who encouraged him to join their theosophic quest. In Cromwellian Britain ecumenical royalists and conversionist parliamentarians took divergent political paths in their search for Cabalistic illumination. That the Stuart exiles profited from their Continental exposure to Lutheran, Calvinist, Catholic, and Jewish architects, mechanists, and chemists is suggested by Charles II's keen interest in their technologies. The king's experimental studies would later influence his support of Moray's proposals for a non-sectarian royal society of science, when the exiles returned to Britain or, as the Scottish Masons called the united kingdom, "Jerusalem."¹

Many Hermeticists still associated J.V. Andreae with Rosicrucianism; however, since 1628 he had publicly distanced his pansophic projects

¹ Kincardine MS.5050.ff.84–85 (20 May 1660, Moray to Alexander Bruce).

from the earlier movement.² In his *Vita* (1642), Andreae lamented that period “when a certain fabulous fraternity had befuddled inquisitive minds.”³ He had formed “this *Image of a Certain Christian Society*, which, I had intended, we could place in opposition to the unworthy mockery of the fiction of the Rosicrucian Fraternity.” Thus, while Andreae and the Antilians were influenced by the ideals of Rosicrucianism, they later tried to establish rival Protestant societies which included conversion of the Jews as a priority. This point would become relevant to the “chemical college” maintained in England by Henshaw, Vaughan, and several Catholic royalists, and to Moray’s own Cabalistic and Rosicrucian contacts in Europe.

In 1650 an English translation of Sendivogius’s *Novum Lumen Chymicum* was published in London by John French, who had been at Oxford with Thomas Vaughan before becoming physician to the parliamentary army.⁴ Vaughan subsequently based his alchemical practice on Sendivogian theories.⁵ One early reader of *A New Light of Alchymie* was John Evelyn, who was also studying Wotton’s *Elements of Architecture* at this time.⁶ French addressed “the true Sons of Hermes,” whom most readers believed were Rosicrucians, and he identified the three wise men of the New Testament as Cabalistic brethren of the Jews:

Cabala, or *Cabalia*, is a most secret science, which is said to be delivered by divine inspiration, together with the law of Moses, the Hebrew Rabbies asserting the same. The Persians were most diligent seekers of this Art, being also possessors of the same, as appears by their calling of their wise men . . . such as those three that came to Christ out of the East to worship him, and not Kings, as the ignorant vulgar think them to be . . .⁷

Read notes that the new edition of *Novum Lumen Chymicum* spread not only the fame of Sendivogius but also revived that of “the romantic and forgotten son of Scotia, Alexander Seton.”⁸ Ancram, now in

² J. Andreae, *Christianopolis*, 7.

³ D. Dickson, *Tessera*, 41–42.

⁴ “John French,” *DNB*. He published translations of Hermes Trismegistus, Paracelsus, Agrippa, and Glauber, as well as accounts of his own chemical and alchemical experiments.

⁵ D. Dickson, *Tessera*, 192.

⁶ Michael Hunter, *Science and the Shape of Orthodoxy* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1995), 74.

⁷ J.F., M.D. [John French], *A New Light of Alchymie* (London: Richard Cotes, 1650), appendix, “Cabala.”

⁸ J. Read, *Humour*, 65.

exile in Holland, acquired the English translation, which suggests his continuing contact with Hermetic colleagues in Britain.⁹ In 1651 Ancram's friend Dr. Davison resigned his position at the *Jardin du Roi* in order to take a position as physician and chemist to John Casimir, the Catholic king of Poland. According to Aubrey, Davison really "went into Poland to gett acquaintance with the Brothers of the Rosie-Cross."¹⁰ One of these was probably John Jonston, "a poly-histor born in Poland of a Scottish family," who quoted Seton and Sendivogius and met Fludd; according to Prinke, Jonston was "a possible Rosicrucian of the second generation."¹¹ After studying at St. Andrews in 1623–25, when he developed a great admiration for Scottish Maccabean traditions and the mathematical expertise of John Napier, Jonston returned to Poland, where he joined Comenius's pansophic network.¹²

Though Jonston initially advocated "liberty of conscience," he later supported the Protestant agenda of Hartlib and Dury, and he may have joined the more radical Rosicrucians in Poland, as suggested by his private note to Hartlib:

Let what you see on this side of the paper be for your eyes alone. I would not wish other eyes to be allowed into the Eleusinian rites, which are revealed to the initiated alone . . . I beg you, burn this page . . . Do write in English, in secret.¹³

If Dr. Davison contacted Jonston's "initiated" brothers, his work for the Stuart cause may have been compromised, for Hartlib sent extracts from Jonston's letters to John Thurloe, Cromwell's secretary of state.

Both Jonston and Davison maintained contacts with Scots in Holland; thus, it is possible that Moray, who was close to Davison, learned about the expansion of Rosicrucianism into various countries. In 1653 Ashmole received information that "the Fratres RC: live about Strasburg: 7 miles from thence in a monastery."¹⁴ Further evidence of Rosicrucian activity emerged from Charles II's contacts

⁹ Kerr's library.

¹⁰ J. Read, "William Davidson," 78.

¹¹ Rafal Prinke, "Michael Sendivogius and Christian Rosenkreutz," *HJ* (1990), 92, 94. Prinke mentions another Scot, Thomas Seget, with Polish Rosicrucian connections.

¹² W.J. Hitchens, *Letters of Jan Jonston*, 13–24.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 119; see also 23, 104, 129, 144.

¹⁴ C. Josten, *Ashmole*, II, 682n.5. Diary note in 1653.

with Queen Christina of Sweden, a student of the occult sciences. Michel Le Blon, her Amsterdam-based art consultant, was rumored to be a Rosicrucian and author of a tract for the fraternity.¹⁵ The queen was probably aware that Swedish Rosicrucian networks were currently functioning in the Baltic region.¹⁶ But Christina's interest was not in militant Protestant Rosicrucianism, for she was a private believer in a universalist Catholicism. A strong monarchist, she was horrified by the execution of Charles I, and she became a determined but secret supporter of his son's restoration effort.

Hoping to find a freer spiritual and intellectual life, Christina abdicated her throne and fled to the Continent in July 1654. In September Christina wrote from Antwerp to Charles II to thank him for the many tokens of friendship he had sent by his personal representatives, the Scottish agents Patrick Ruthven and William Bellenden, who shared her Hermetic interests. In October she met with Charles near Frankfurt, where she promised to use her influence to renew the French pension for him and to support his cause. However, Christina insisted on absolute secrecy. Cromwell's spies sent a flurry of reports that she planned to marry Charles, who "carries his affairs as close as anyone can do," and they complained of their inability to penetrate the veil of secrecy maintained over his collaboration with her Swedish agents. We shall return to the curious relationship between Christina and Charles II, when we examine the alleged expansion of Scottish Freemasonry into Sweden and the development of a Jewish support system for the Stuart Restoration.

In the meantime in London, Thomas Vaughan published *Euphrates, or the Waters of the East* (1655), in which he drew on Lull and Sendivogius to argue against the sectarian bigots who condemn Hermetic studies as heretical and seditious. In order to diminish the influence of the "broylers," students should follow the "advice of the Brothers of the R.C."¹⁷ Utilizing one of Lull's diagrammatic wheels, Vaughan asserted that "we will ground our Discourse upon nothing but what is visible, and in the front of it we place the Divine Majestie, who is the sole Centrell Eternall Principle and Architect of all." He then revealed a highly erotic, alchemical version of the marriage of

¹⁵ S. Akerman, "Queen Christina's . . . Manuscript," 14–15.

¹⁶ Susanna Akerman, *Queen Christina of Sweden and Her Circle* (Leiden: Brill, 1991), and *Rose Cross*, *passim*.

¹⁷ T. Vaughan, *Works*, 534, 525.

God and *Shekinah*, in which he drew upon Cabalistic theories of the copulating cherubim in the Holy of Holies:

The air of a Truth, is that *Temple*, where Inferiours are married to their Superiours; for to this place the Heavenly Light descends, and is united to the areareall oleous Humidity, which is hid in the Belly of the Water; This light being hotter than the water, makes her turgid and vitall, and increaseth her seminall viscous moisture; so that she is ready to depose her sperme or limositie, were she but united to her proper Male . . . To this purpose she descends hither again, and immediatly the Male laies hold upon her, and his fierie sulphurous substance unites to her Limosity.¹⁸

Given the context of debate within the Cromwellian government about the readmission of Jews to England, Vaughan's royalist praise of them is significant. After quoting an "Opinion I have read sometimes in the Cabalists," Vaughan excused himself to his "angrie Readers," for "I deliver not this as my own Sentiment, but as the Tradition of the Jewes, who were sometimes a very learned people, and knew more of the Mysteryes of God and Nature, than any other Nation whatsoever."¹⁹ The "Opinion" was the Cabalistic tradition that "the seminall particle (say they) lurketh somewhere in the bones, not in that part which moulders into dust." Vaughan's discourse on the mystical significance of the bone called *Luz* sheds new light on the curious Masonic tradition of a secret hidden in the marrow bone, which emerged in confused forms in early eighteenth-century lodge catechisms.²⁰

Vaughan linked the seminal light hidden in a bone to the fire hidden in a pit by the Maccabees during their captivity—a linkage that would be attractive to Scottish Freemasons, whose ancestors identified themselves with the heroic Maccabees who purified the Temple. Giving a further Hermetic explication of the seminal essence as both light and dew, he stressed again the Jewish origins of the tradition:

The truth is that this Myserie belong'd to the Jewish Church; the Priests and Prophets having receiv'd it from the Patriarchs; I mean from Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and they from Noah, and all of them from Adam . . . These indeed were the men that planted the

¹⁸ Ibid., 539.

¹⁹ Ibid., 531–32.

²⁰ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 145–49.

World, and instructed Posterity; and these and none other must be those antient and first Philosophers, whom Zadith calls *Avos Mundi* . . .²¹

To understand the political significance of Vaughan's pro-Jewish statements in 1655, we must retrace the agitation for Jewish readmission that began six years earlier.

Though the appeal of a party of Dutch Jews to Parliament has received ample attention from historians, the adherence of a larger number of European Jews to the royalist cause has often been minimized or ignored.²² Moreover, the clandestine Jewish support for Charles II's restoration effort had a significant effect on Stuart Freemasonry—an effect that ramified into the eighteenth century. On 5 January 1649, twenty-five days before the execution of Charles I, Ashmole recorded in his diary: "The Jewes Petition was presented."²³ He referred to an appeal to Parliament by two English subjects, Joanna and Ebenezer Cartwright, members of a Baptist congregation in Amsterdam. Believing that the Civil War in Britain was a sign of God's wrath towards England, the Cartwrights discussed with "the Dutch Jews" the means of appeasing that wrath by repealing "the inhumane cruel Statute of banishment."²⁴ Then, the Jews "under the Christian banner of charity, and brotherly love, may again be received and permitted to trade and dwell amongst you in this Land, as now they do in the Netherlands." A colophon to the printed petition reported that their request was "favourably received with a promise to take it into speedy consideration, when the present more publike affairs are dispatched."

Given the victory of the radical Presbyterians and Judaizing Covenanters in Parliament at this time, the sympathetic response was understandable. However, the public dispatch (execution) of Charles I threw the Jewish question into a new and more complex context. Some royalist tracts charged that Cromwell intended to sell St. Paul's, the Bodleian Library, and Whitehall Palace to the Jews, who would convert them into synagogues. That the Banqueting Hall

²¹ T. Vaughan, *Works*, 550.

²² David Katz, *Philo-Semitism and the Readmission of the Jews to England, 1603–1655* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982); Norman Roth, "Social and Intellectual Currents in England in the Century Preceding the Jew Bill of 1753" (Cornell University, Ph.D. Thesis, 1978), 128–46.

²³ C. Josten, *Ashmole*, II, 484.

²⁴ D. Katz, *Philo-Semitism*, 177–82.

at Whitehall featured Rubens's great Solomonic paintings, which were detested by radical Puritans, lent credibility to the charge that the Jews especially wanted "that beautiful room." Various parliamentarians, fueled by millenarian views of the king's execution and establishment of the Commonwealth, placed the readmission question in the context of the Jews' imminent conversion in the rapidly approaching Last Days. In 1650 Menasseh ben Israel dedicated to Parliament *The Hope of Israel*, in which he argued that the recently announced discovery of the lost tribes of Israel in South America should encourage the English to readmit the Jews and thus hasten the millennium.²⁵

Menasseh's pamphlet was answered in 1650 by Sir Edward Spencer, member of the Long Parliament, who yearned for the conversion of the Jews but also feared the radically millenarian politics of some self-proclaimed philo-Semites. Spencer agreed that English Protestantism and Judaism bore significant similarities, especially their shared hostility to idolatry.²⁶ However, he also feared that the Jews shared even more with the Scots, and he was determined to prevent a rumored Jewish-Scottish alliance on behalf of Charles II. Spencer's fears were rooted in Henrietta Maria's overture to the Jews in 1642 and rumors about continuing contacts by Stuart agents. After his father's execution, Charles II spent one and a half years in Holland, and in April 1650 he "tried unsuccessfully to borrow £50,000 from some merchants in Amsterdam for an invasion of England."²⁷ Though little is known about this transaction, suspicions emerged of Jewish involvement. Picciotto observes that "an old friendship subsisted between the Jews and Charles II" and that "the presence of a Jew in the retinue of the Queen [Henrietta Maria] may have had some influence."²⁸ Stuart propagandists further appealed to the Jews by basing their claims for hereditary monarchy on Old Testament precedents, as argued in Charles I's *Eikon Basilike*.

Spencer's reply to Menasseh came in the wake of the king's execution, when the Scots declared their support for Charles II. Thus,

²⁵ D. Katz, *Jews in History*, 113-15.

²⁶ Edward Spencer, *A Breife Epistle to the Learned Menasseh ben Israel, in answer to his, dedicated to the Parliament* (London, 1650); A. Williamson, "The Judeo-Scots," 248.

²⁷ Wilfrid Samuel, "Sir William Davidson, Royalist, and the Jews," *Transactions of Jewish Historical Society of England*, 14 (1935-39), 59.

²⁸ James Picciotto, *Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History*, rev. ed., ed. Israel Finestine (1875; London: Soncino, 1956), 41.

he argued that the Jews should not be misled by the alleged affinity between Jews and Scots ("Ye love Musique, your brethren the Scots hate all but the bagpipes") nor by claims that Charles II is "your new Messias."²⁹ Spencer then proposed extremely harsh conditions for Jewish re-admission to England, and his treatise later played a role in the defeat of Menasseh's proposal. When Menasseh continued his appeals to Parliament and was visited by representatives of Cromwell's government in 1651, he began a risky venture as far as his co-religionists in Amsterdam were concerned. Though Menasseh was invited to London, the outbreak of war between England and Holland in June 1652 prevented his journey.

That rumors still circulated about Scottish-royalist overtures to the Jews is suggested by James Howell's preface to his edition of Joseph ben Gurion's *The Wonderfull and Most Deplorable History of the Latter Times of the Jews, and of the City of Hierusalem* (1652). Though Howell had earlier contributed a panegyric verse to *Eikon Basilike* and composed royalist propaganda, by 1652 he had pragmatically shifted his allegiance to Cromwell. He dedicated *The Latter Times of the Jews* to the anti-royalist Lord Mayor and officials of London (a fact that he would try to cover up after the Restoration). With the exiled Charles II now the covenanted king of Scotland, Howell linked the Stuarts' royalist supporters with the radical Covenanters who had Judaized Scotland. Arguing that contemporary Jews are so cowardly, light, and giddy-headed that they make unworthy allies, Howell compared them to the "apocalyptical zealots of these times," who "fool themselves into some egregious fantastical dotage which nevertheless passeth among them for illumination." He then claimed that the Scots were actually the blood-kin of the Jews:

The first Christian Prince that expelled the Jews out of his territories, was that heroick King, our Edward the First, who was such a scourge also to the Scots; and it is thought diverse families of these banished Jews fled then to Scotland, where they have propagated since in great numbers; witness the aversion that nation hath above all others to hogs-flesh.³⁰

²⁹ E. Spencer, *Breife Epistle*, 248.

³⁰ James Howell, *The Wonderfull, and Most Deplorable History of the Latter Times of the Jews* (1652; London: J.L., 1653), Epistle Dedicatory. Though A. Williamson (in "Judeo-Scots," 247) described this passage as royalist propaganda, Howell had shifted his loyalty by this time; see "James Howell," *DNB*.

Harking back to Milton's charge in *Eikonoklastes* that Charles I and his supporters were a "Sect of Cabalists," Howell gave a summary of the Jews' claims about the Cabala in order to ridicule them:

They much glory of their mysterious Cabal, wherein they make the reality of things to depend upon letters and words; but they hold that the Hebrew hath the sole priviledge of this. This Cabal . . . is, as they say, a reparation in some measure for the loss of our knowlege of Adam; and they say it was revealed four times: first to Adam . . . Then God discovered it to Moses in the bush; the third time to Solomon in a dream, whereby he came to know the commencement, the mediety and consummation of times, whereof he composed many volumes, which were lost in the grand Captivity. The last time, they hold, that God restored the Cabal to Esdras [who] wrote two hundred forty books . . . and those they pretend to be Cabalisticall, and not to be all lost.

Howell concluded his arguments by repeating all the traditional stereotypes about Jews—from blood libels to deformed bodies to bad odors—and prayed that "England not be troubled with that scent again." Even worse, the Jews live "at Rome very quietly under the Pope's nose" and thus are obviously Papists. With the Pope currently supporting the efforts of Charles II, Vatican "protection" of the Jews linked them again to the royalist cause. For Menasseh ben Israel, this production by a new Cromwellian would have been discouraging. However, for royalist purposes Howell's anti-Semitism and Scotophobia may have produced unexpected results, because the claim that medieval Jews found refuge in Scotland linked the latter country with the excitement about the Lost Tribes discovered in South America. Moreover, the alleged kinship between Scots and Jews would increase Jewish support for the Scottish-descended, exiled king of Britain.

While Menasseh's proposal for readmission was exploited by propagandists for both Cromwell and Charles II, the king began the coordination of plots in Scotland and Holland that would later emerge in Jewish support for his restoration. In 1652 Charles ordered John Middleton, his lieutenant-general in Scotland, to travel to The Hague to obtain supplies for a Scottish rebellion.³¹ By March 1653 Middleton was working closely with William Davidson, a Scottish merchant from Dundee, who moved to Amsterdam in 1640 and made a fortune

³¹ R. Hutton, *Charles II*, 79.

in international trade. Davidson's *forte* was "trading with aliens" through a network of Jewish agents and intelligencers. With several Jewish partners, Davidson had invested heavily in trade with the West Indian island of Barbados, which remained stubbornly royalist through 1652, despite Parliament's pressure upon its governors. In retaliation for Dutch inroads on English trade, Cromwell's government passed Navigation Acts that severely impaired the trade of Davidson and his Jewish partners.

As a strong Episcopalian and royalist, Davidson contributed wholeheartedly to Middleton's plans for an armed rising in Scotland, and he borrowed "considerable sums in the King's names for the transport and equipment of the armed force."³² By 1654 Cromwell's spies had reported on Davidson's "zeal in the royal cause," despite the Scot's insistence on absolute secrecy. As one Stuart agent wrote from Amsterdam,

The people heare, at least the governoures, are wholly dedicat to Cromwell, which makes every one extremly warie of making bargaines hes any relation to the King. Our freind Mr. Davison (tho the danger, if knouen, is not lesse then his whole (fortoun) is very firme to what he hath promised, but is most earnestly desiros that his name be not on any tearmes mad knouen to any other what some wer; if it be, he will altogether disown us, for his ruine can bring no advantage to his Ma'tie. I assured him such feare was needlesse, non in the world knew any thing of him (but such and such persones) as having any interest amongst us.³³

Davidson was so successful in covering his tracks that no documents survive with the names of the money-lenders. However, it seems certain that he called upon his friends in the Jewish community for assistance to the royalist cause. While Davidson and Middleton in Holland secretly raised funds, Moray in Scotland prepared for the arrival of these troops and arms. This network of Davidson, Middleton, Moray, and certain royalist Jews would later take on a Masonic significance. Unfortunately, the network lost a long-time supporter when the Earl of Ancram died in 1654, for he had developed contacts with the philo-Semitic circle of the great painter Rembrandt, who lived in the Jewish quarter and whose glowing portrayals of

³² Ibid., 59.

³³ Letter from Col. Alex. Durham (26 October 1654); in Sir Edward Nicholas, *The Nicholas Papers*, ed. George Warner (London: Camden Society, 1892), II, 106.

Dutch Jews endowed them with a mystical nobility. Ancram was the first to bring portraits by Rembrandt to Britain, and the artist's associate Jan Leewens made a memorable portrait of their Scottish friend during his poverty-stricken final days.³⁴

Meanwhile in London, the debate on readmission of the Jews provoked a plethora of pamphlets, pro and contra, with conversion expected as the price for any new privileges.³⁵ However, conversion was not the agenda of Charles II and the royalists abroad. Perhaps aware of Stuart-Jewish contacts in Holland, Ashmole undertook his own philo-Semitic project. On 27 February 1652 he began to study Hebrew under the tutelage of Solomon Franco, a Jewish scholar, who lived discretely in London and who shared Ashmole's royalist sympathies, interests in Cabala, and devotion to the mystical architecture of the Temple.³⁶ A month earlier Ashmole noted that a man who merely learns Hebrew cannot "be accounted a Caballisticall Rabbi," implying that the latter expertise was hard-won.³⁷ His manuscript "Of the Cabalisticall Doctrine" was probably the fruit of his study with Franco.³⁸

Though little more is known about Franco, he was probably informed by Ashmole about the predictions of a bizarre Welsh prophet, Arise Evans, that Charles II was the Messiah destined to convert the Jews and lead them back to Israel.³⁹ Evans had previously supported Cromwell and praised Menasseh ben Israel as "the leader of the Elect Jewes" who will call and deliver the Ten Tribes; thus his royalist tract, *A Voice from Heaven to the Commonwealth* (1652), caused a stir among millenarians. While Menasseh saw the Commonwealth as the great hope of the Jews, Evans argued that "Charles, the Son of Charles Stuart by name, comes to the elect Jewes, to deliver them from the darknesse; and to bring them to Jesus Christ and eternall life."⁴⁰ Fueled by his visions and "foreknowledge," Evans tried to persuade various Independents and

³⁴ Scottish National Portrait Gallery: informational note on Ancram's portrait.

³⁵ F. Routledge, *Calendar . . . Clarendon*, II, 233.

³⁶ For Franco's royalist and mystical beliefs, see his *Truth Springing Out of the Earth* (London, 1668), 32–40, 50, 67–70.

³⁷ A. Ashmole, *Theatrum Chemicum*, 453.

³⁸ E. Bernard, *Catalogi*, I, "Ashmole's MSS.," 351.

³⁹ See the chapter on Arise Evans in Christopher Hill, *Change and Continuity in Seventeenth-Century England*, rev. ed. (New Haven: Yale UP, 1991), 48–63.

⁴⁰ D. Katz, *Philo-Semitism*, 121–22.

Cromwell himself to restore Charles II. On 20 April 1653 Ashmole recorded:

This morning I first became acquainted with Arise Evans, & speaking of the Parliament I asked him when it would end: He answered the tyme was short, & it was even at the dore.

The very morning at 11 a'clock, the mace was taken away from the speaker, & the Parliament dissolved; and I conjecture it was much about the time that A: Evans & I had this discourse.⁴¹

However, the Cromwellian conversionists received reinforcement from Eliazar Bar-Isajah, "born a Jew but now a baptized Christian," who dedicated his *Vindication of the Christians Messiah* (1653) to the "Parliament of the Commonwealth of England."

Though Menasseh ben Israel also hoped to gain parliamentary favor, he was frustrated in his attempts to visit England. Thus, he turned his attention to Queen Christina, who had developed unusual friendships with Jews and who hoped to open Sweden to Jewish immigration.⁴² Christina's physician was Dr. Benedict de Castro, who combined studies in Cabalistic mysticism with physiological research.⁴³ De Castro perhaps informed Christina about his friend Menasseh ben Israel, for she became interested in the latter's Hebrew collection. In 1650 her agent in Amsterdam, Michel le Blon, offered her twenty of the rabbi's manuscripts, including one entitled *De Magia Cabalistica*, of which Menasseh "fait très grand estat." Akerman argues that this was the *Sefer-ha-Raziel*, the alleged source book for the Rosicrucian movement.⁴⁴ Encouraged by Christina's interest in Jewish lore, Menasseh offered to act as her agent in the purchase of Hebrew works for her library.⁴⁵ When she responded favourably, he aspired to become her mentor at court and to secretly negotiate the admission of Jews to Sweden.⁴⁶ However, the queen's abdication in June 1654 shattered Menasseh's dream.

Christina had earlier supported the irenic schemes of Dury and Comenius and welcomed both to Sweden, but she became disillusioned.

⁴¹ C. Josten, *Ashmole*, II, 641–42.

⁴² S. Akerman, *Christina*, 178–88; David S. Katz, "Menasseh ben Israel's Mission to Queen Christina of Sweden, 1651–1655," *Jewish Social Studies*, 45 (1983), 57–71.

⁴³ "De Castro," *EJ*.

⁴⁴ S. Akerman, *Christina*, 147–48; "Queen Christina's . . . Manuscript," 13–15.

⁴⁵ D. Katz, "Menasseh," 57–92.

⁴⁶ Johan Archenholtz, *Mémoires concernant Christine Reine de Suède* (Amsterdam: Pierre Mortier and Jean Schreuder, 1751–1760), I, 303–04.

sioned with the sectarian fragmentation that beset the Protestant cause. Hoping to develop a tolerant "higher" religion and universal monarchy, she secretly planned to convert to Catholicism once she was out of Sweden. With rumors circulating about her Papist tendencies, she aroused even more hostility by her displays of a broader ecumenicism. Included in her traveling party were two Jews, Dr. De Castro and Abraham Texeira, a wealthy banker who became her intimate friend and financial adviser. When she arrived *incognito* in Hamburg in July, she lodged in Texeira's house, "slighting that which the Magistrates had designed for her," and she received an enthusiastic welcome from the Jewish community.⁴⁷ Moving on to Antwerp in August, she again lodged with a Jew, the wealthy banker Gerard Salian, an associate of Texeira.

Menasseh also traveled to Antwerp, in hope of receiving payment for services already rendered to Christina. Though the queen received him favorably, Menasseh was disappointed to learn that she would not return to Sweden. Realizing that the controversial Christina was not the proper vehicle for his millenial campaign of Jewish-Christian *rapprochement*, Menasseh turned his attention back to the Commonwealth government in England. Christina, who learned about Menasseh's appeal to Cromwell, established contacts with royalist Jews who shared her views about universalist religion. Over the next months, she developed an international communication network with sympathetic Jewish merchants and bankers who could serve her needs and those of Charles II. Thus, by the time Christina met Charles in October, she probably reported that he could count on secret Jewish support. It was no coincidence that in 1654, while Charles was collaborating with Christina, he knighted William Davidson, his liaison with the Jews in Holland. Moreover, Christina was aware of Davidson's secret role in the purchase of ships and arms from Scottish royalists resident in Sweden.⁴⁸

At The Hague Charles II's aunt Elizabeth (the Winter Queen) was eager to learn about his conversations with Christina, whom she hoped would marry her son Charles Louis, now restored as Elector Palatine. At the same time, she warned her son that their former chaplain Dury meant to pass by Heidelberg on his way from Switzerland:

⁴⁷ D. Katz, "Menasseh," 67.

⁴⁸ F. Routledge, *Calendar . . . Clarendon*, I, 322, 395; II, 186, 256, 432.

I hope you will neither see him nor suffer him to have anie kinde of favour or stay in your countrie, for though he be a minister, he is the basest rascall that ever was of that coat. He writt and printed a booke, where he aproves the king my dear Brothers murther, which I have read, and he has translated into French Milletons book [Milton's *Eikonklastes*] against the kings book [*Eikon Basilike*].⁴⁹

Elizabeth was especially worried about any contact between the Elector Palatine and Dury, because her son maintained a friendly relationship with the English Parliament, whom she blamed for the execution of her brother. Embittered by her belief that Dury betrayed the Stuarts' earlier trust in him, she scorned a report from Switzerland that Dury "denied he ever aproved my Brothers murder," for "he lyes most impudently."

Thus, as Menasseh renewed his campaign for readmission of the Jews to England, he was tainted by the suspicions surrounding some of his public supporters—especially Dury, who was not fully trusted by various parties in the debate. Since the radical Puritan Prynne condemned Dury as a hypocritical opportunist in *The Time-serving Proteus, and Ambidexter Divine* (1650), Dury's self-proclaimed image as *The Unchanged, Constant and Single-hearted Peace-Maker* (1650) was further tarnished by the revelation that he was the anonymous author of a French translation of Milton's *Eikonoklastes* (1652), a fact he tried to hide from European irenicists. By 1655 Dury was back on the Continent, acting as Cromwell's unofficial agent. When Menasseh left for England in September, he learned that Dury—whom he believed was a supporter—could not participate in the Whitehall Conference called to debate the Jewish immigration proposal.

Though Menasseh was pleased with Cromwell's support for the conference, he was surprised to find strong support for the exiled Stuart king among his own philo-Semitic admirers. In a meeting with Arise Evans, he listened to the prophet's argument for Charles II's millenarian role. Menasseh then expressed his doubts that the Stuart king was a suitable choice for the Messiah, and he recommended instead Cromwell or the new king of Sweden. But Evans replied, "He that lives five years to an end, shall see King *Charles Steeward* flourish on his Throne to the amazement of all the world,

⁴⁹ Letter dated 26 October 1654; see L.M. Baker, ed., *The Letters of Elizabeth of Bohemia* (London: Bodley Head, 1953), 221, 246.

for God will bring him in without bloodshed."⁵⁰ Evans further warned that "those Jews who would come into England without his [Charles's] command, come against God," and "therefore if they come, they shall in short time be spoiled and destroyed." As a famous Welsh prophet and friend of Ashmole, Evans was almost certainly known to Thomas Vaughan who published his own royalist praise of the Jews in 1655. Thus, Ashmole's and Vaughan's overtures to Jews occurred in a context when "the needy Royalists were looking longingly towards the Netherlands Jews and had been doing so for some years past."⁵¹

At this time, Charles II was desperately trying to unite potential supporters from many religious faiths, who would seek toleration under his restored government. He utilized the services of Sir Marmaduke Langdale, who became a Catholic after seeing a prophetic vision of his conversion in a magician's glass in Italy.⁵² In September 1655 in Brussels, Langdale collaborated with Richard Overton, an English Leveller, in an attempt to gain Jewish support for the royalist cause. Langdale had been approached by Colonel Edward Sexby, a former radical leader, who "seamed much to favour them [the Jews] as necessary for a kingdome, and I believe there tenets do not much differ." Langdale then instructed Overton to "sound there intentions by some of his party in Holland." Unfortunately, Overton learned that Menasseh and his partisans had departed for London, where they planned to negotiate readmission with Parliament. Though Langdale was "very sorry they agree with Cromwell," he did not give up hope:

The Jewes are considerable all the world over, and the great masters of money. If his Ma'ty could have them or divert them from Cromwell, it were a very good service. I heard of this 3 yeares agoe, but hoped the Jewes, that understand the interest of all the princes in the world, had bene too wise to adventure themselves and estates under Cromwell, where they may by his death or other alteracion in that kingdome runn the hazard of an absolute ruine; but they hate monarchy and are angry for the patent that was granted by King James to my Lord of Suffolke for the discovery of them, which made most of the ablest of them fly out of England.⁵³

⁵⁰ C. Hill, *Change and Continuity*, 56.

⁵¹ W. Samuel, "Davidson," 59.

⁵² J. Aubrey, *Miscellanies*, 166.

⁵³ E. Nicholas, *Nicholas Papers*, III, 51.

Overton's information about James I's persecution and the Jews' hatred of monarchy came from radical Protestants in touch with Menasseh's party, and Langdale noted that "those Rabbies are to be sent thither [to England] so I am glad I dealt with them by proxie."⁵⁴ Though there are no surviving official records of the Jacobean affair, two letters (dated August 1609) from the Tuscan and Venetian ambassadors in London reveal an internecine quarrel among the Portuguese merchants in London, which resulted in accusations that some were "living secretly as Jews."⁵⁵ The mercenary Earl of Suffolk tried to exploit the situation but was allegedly bribed into allowing at least one prominent Jew to remain. James I would subsequently protect Casaubon's Jewish scholar against arrest by conversionists, and he recommended various Marrano merchants for trading privileges. As Cecil Roth observes, "the position of Marranos in England, so long as they lay low and said nothing, was generally speaking secure enough, and they realised the fact."⁵⁶ Of course, the Jews in Holland—who were free to live openly as Jews—were in a much better situation.

That Charles used the Catholic convert Langdale in the Brussels outreach to the Jews was not surprising, for he was probably aware that in London the Marranos held their religious services in the residence of the Spanish ambassador, a Catholic supporter of the Stuart cause.⁵⁷ Moreover, the embassy chaplain was Father Ker, a royalist Scot. When war broke out between England and Spain in autumn 1655, the two left London, but Ker would be sent back on a secret mission in November 1656. Puritan critics of the Jews accused them of dissimulation, and rumors circulated that Jewish rites were performed in the Portuguese embassy chapel, where the ambassador himself was allegedly a crypto-Jew. It seems likely that this Catholic-Jewish liaison was linked with Stuart overtures to the Jews—perhaps through Scottish intermediaries.

Langdale sent his reports to Secretary Nicholas, Hyde's partisan in the English faction, but they were not not informed about Davidson's secret collaboration with royalist Jews in Amsterdam. The latter pro-

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, III, 44.

⁵⁵ Edgar Samuel, "Portuguese Jews in Jacobean London," *TJHSE*, 18 (1953–55), 171–230.

⁵⁶ C. Roth, "Middle Period," 9–10.

⁵⁷ Wilfred Samuel, "The Jewish Oratories of Cromwellian London," *MJHSE*, Part III (1937), 46–55.

ject, which was secretly managed by the Scottish faction, encouraged Charles II to continue his overtures to Jews in Germany. On 25 September 1655 the Duke of Ormonde reported from Frankfurt that he and the royal party had visited "the Jewes sinagogue."⁵⁸ At the same time, they arranged a meeting between Charles and Christina, who had strengthened her ties with various Jewish agents and financiers. The rendezvous was perhaps relevant to the Jewish outreach, for a royalist correspondent reported, "for the commitments in Holland, of which I have all the particulars, I beleieve there is something more in it." By this time, Christina's public conversion to Catholicism had provoked a barrage of criticism. When asked if she were really Lutheran or Catholic, she replied, "I myself believe in a third religion, which, having found the truth, has cast aside the beliefs of these established churches, because it has rejected these beliefs as untrue."⁵⁹

When Menasseh arrived in London in October 1655, he was probably aware of the failure of the Glencairn Rising in Scotland, which sent a new flood of Scottish refugees into Holland. If Sir William Davidson called upon his Jewish friends when he raised funds for the rising, then they all suffered considerable losses after financing the ships and arms that Middleton transported to Moray and Balcarres in Scotland. Perhaps Menasseh was encouraged by Monk's decisive victory to believe that the Jews' best hope lay with the reigning Commonwealth government. His kinsman David Abarbanel, who had earlier served in Cromwell's intelligence department in Amsterdam, now resided in London and provided Menasseh with a "base" for overtures to Jews and Christians.⁶⁰

While Evans's warnings to the Jews about the consequences of supporting Cromwell surprised Menasseh, Prynne's diatribe against admission was even more disheartening. In his *Short Demurrer to the Jewes* (1655), the former castigator of Laud's "hot popish scent" recounted instances of ritual murder, economic crimes, and conversionist plots attempted by the Jews before their justifiable expulsion from England. Prynne's tract received a wide readership, and his

⁵⁸ E. Nicholas, *Nicholas Papers*, III, 61.

⁵⁹ Margaret Goldsmith, *Christina of Sweden* (New York, 1935), 177; also, Richard Popkin, "Menasseh ben Israel and Isaac La Peyrère. II.," *Studia Rosenthalia*, 18 (1984), 13-14.

⁶⁰ W. Samuels, "Jewish Oratories," 52.

anti-Semitic argument had a huge influence on the final defeat of Menasseh's proposal.

In the meantime, Cromwell's secretary Thurloe had written Dury, soliciting his opinion on the Jewish question. In a letter to Harltib that he subsequently published, Dury expressed such caveats about readmission that his modern image as a philo-Semite must be re-examined. He conceded that the Jews might be of some use in Cromwell's war against Spain, but restraints must be placed on their activities. After reading Menasseh's actual proposals, Dury became even more cautious. England should "go warily, and by degrees," because the Jews "have ways beyond all other men, to undermine a state, and to insinuate into those that are in offices, and prejudicate the trade of others."⁶¹

The fact that Prynne's pamphlet was produced by a famous apologist for regicide and that Dury's tract was insulting to the Jews would increase the sympathy of royalist Jews for Charles II. On 24 January 1656 Nicholas received a report that "Cromwell says it is an ungodly thing to admit the Jews," but if he refuses them, it is because they will not pay him the sum demanded "unless they have the authority of parliament for their being there with safety."⁶² A frustrated Menasseh waited in vain for that official parliamentary approval. After news reached Amsterdam of Menasseh's impasse, a party of prominent Jews approached Charles II at Bruges and assured him that they neither assisted nor approved of Menasseh's overtures to Cromwell.⁶³ From now on, the identification of exiled Scottish royalists with the Jews would become politically significant—and Masonically relevant.

By March 1656, though the Jewish readmission project was stalled in London, Menasseh and six Sephardi Jews gained Cromwell's permission to perform religious services in their private residences.⁶⁴ However, Menasseh was frustrated by the lack of unanimous support in London's Hebrew community, which harbored various Stuart partisans, and the "Jewish question" gradually deteriorated into con-

⁶¹ John Dury, *A Case of Conscience, Whether it be Lawful to Admit Jews into a Christian Common-wealth?* (London, 1656), 256; see D. Katz, *Philo-Semitism*, 219.

⁶² E. Nicholas, *Nicholas Papers*, III, 255.

⁶³ Lucien Wolf, "Status of the Jews in England after the Resettlement," *TJHSE*, 4 (1901), 182.

⁶⁴ W. Samuel, "Jewish Oratories," 46–47, 53.

fusion and indifference. In the meantime, Ashmole continued his Hebrew studies with Franco, whom he may have introduced to David Ramsay, his fellow Mason, who was often in Ashmole's company. Despite the necessity for secrecy, given government surveillance, these students of Cabala and the esoteric sciences tried to keep up with Rosicrucian (and perhaps Masonic) developments on the Continent.

In 1656 the royalist astrologers Timothy and John Gadbury dedicated their *Astronomicall Tables* to Ashmole. Praising his "Knowledge in all Sciences, (Especially the Mathematiques)," they commended him "to the safeguard of the Great Architect of Heaven and Earth"—a phrase that Josten considers Masonic.⁶⁵ In that year, Ashmole also received a dedication from Nathaniell and Thomas Hodges, who published their translation of Michael Maier's *Themis Aurea. The Laws of the Fraternity of the Rosie Cross*. The royalist translators stressed those statements of Maier that would distance the fraternity from the proselytizing agendas of the Antillians and Cromwellians, thus placing *Themis Aurea* clearly in the tradition of pacific, ecumenical Stuart Rosicrucianism:

That the Brethrn of the Rosy Cross does neither dream of, hope for, or indeavour any Reformation in the world by Religion, the conversion of the Jews, or the policies of Enthusiasts . . . They who bend their thoughts to change Commonwealths, to alter Religion, to innovate the Arts, make use very often of most despicable instruments to do their business . . .⁶⁶

The Gadburys reminded readers of the peace and prosperity earlier enjoyed under the Solomonic reigns of their Stuart kings, who supported "that true Magick by which we come to the knowledge of the secret works of Nature, which "the greatest Monarchs and Kings have studied."⁶⁷

Eschewing anti-Catholic campaigns, these English royalists defined the kind of Rosicrucianism that appealed to Queen Christina, whose "third religion" was strikingly similar. The queen was now welcomed to Rome with lavish ceremonies and symbolic obelisks designed by Athanasius Kircher, her great admirer. He was aware of her Rosicrucian interests, which were stimulated by Bureus, and he received

⁶⁵ C. Josten, *Ashmole*, II, 679–81.

⁶⁶ Michael Maier, *Themis Aurea. The Laws of the Fraternity of the Rosie Crosse* (London: N. Brooke, 1656), 132–33.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 44.

in 1651 a copy of the Swedish theosopher's *Fa Ma*.⁶⁸ Soon after her arrival, Christina established a secret academy, in which participants used fictional names and allowed no written records of their meetings. With her clandestine initiates, she pursued her esoteric studies, while she maintained contact with her Jewish and Stuart friends.

Angered by the coalition with Cromwell made by her personally chosen successor Carl X, Christina urged her Jewish allies to support the Stuart cause. One Jew who may have heeded her call was Rabbi Leon, who admired Christina and would later dedicate a work to her agent Teixeira.⁶⁹ Moreover, in the wake of Cromwell's failure to officially open England to Jewish immigration, the Stuarts must have seemed a more tolerant alternative than Menasseh's parliamentarians. Thus, in summer 1656, "some principle persons of the Hebrew nation residing in Amsterdam" called on John Middleton and pledged their support for the Stuart restoration effort.⁷⁰ If Leon participated in this delegation, it would explain his later association with Stuart Freemasonry. In September Middleton reported to Charles II, who was in Bruges with Moray, that the Jews were anxious to dissociate themselves from Menasseh's negotiations with Cromwell. Because Moray was the confidante of both Charles II and Middleton, he must have been privy to the negotiations that ensued.

Writing from Bruges, the king responded favorably to reports about the Jewish overture, and on 24 September he sent instructions to Middleton:

When you come to Amsterdam, you will behave your selfe in this Commission wee have given you to the Jewes in such manner as upon ther behaviour to you shall judge fitt, and if you finde the same good disposition in them towards our service which they expressed to you heretofore, by assuring them of our gracious disposition and how willing we shall be (when God shall restore us) to extende our protection to them, and to abate the rigour of the Lawes against them in our several dominions, and . . . they shall lay a signal obligacion upon us, it will not only dispose us to be gracious to them, and to be willinge to protecte them, but be a morall assurance to them that wee shall be able to do whatsoever wee shall be willinge when we can justly

⁶⁸ The Bochemenist theosopher Abraham Frankenberg sent it to Kircher; see S. Akerman, *Rose Cross*, 3, 45, 166.

⁶⁹ J. Van Praag, "Jacob Judah Leon," 14n.1.

⁷⁰ W. Samuel, "Davidson," 59–60.

publish and declare to all men how much wee have bene beholdinge to them, and how farr they have contributed towards our restoration.⁷¹

The king, who had recently made Middleton an earl, entrusted him to judge "their actual disposition."

In a second letter sent on the same day, Charles wrote further instructions to Middleton, "the Lieutenant-General of Scotland":

... whereas you have represented to us the good affection which some principle persons of the Hebrew Nacion residing in Amsterdam have expressed towards our service, and that they have assured you that the application which has been lately made to Cromwell on ther behalfe by some members of that nacion hath been without ther consent, and is utterly disavowed by them, and they are desirous of all offices to expresse ther good will to us and desyre our reestablishment.

In an important addition, Charles told Middleton that he should assure the Jews that "wee are very farr from that prejudice to them to looke on them as enemyes." Thus, though the king's offer of readmission was conditional on their making "contributions of mony, Armes or Ammunition," his promise of toleration did not include pressure or expectation that they would convert to Christianity. The king's show of respect for the Jews as Jews was especially important at this time, for conversionist efforts by various English Quakers in Amsterdam was causing resentment and controversy in the synagogue congregations.⁷²

Rumors about the Stuart-Jewish negotiation reached the Cromwellian government, who received a report in November that a Jew named Da Costa, a great merchant in London, had received £4,000 for the use of Charles Stuart; even worse, the Jew-lover Christina publicly inveighed against the Protector.⁷³ Probably in response to these charges, an anti-royalist author ("I.H.") published *A Relation of the Life of Christina* (1656), in which he accused her not only lodging with a Jew, "a man, who is by Profession, a sworn enemy of Jesus Christ," but of having sexual relations with him and being served by a demonic succubus. Christina replied defiantly:

⁷¹ C. Firth, *Scotland*, 342-43.

⁷² See David S. Katz, *Sabbath and Sectarianism in Seventeenth-Century England* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1988), 156-67.

⁷³ J. Thurloe, *Collection*, VI, 572, 711.

Jesus Christ had all his life-time conversed with Jews; that he himself was come of their Seed; and that he had preferred their company to the Company of all other Nations. Now judge ye your selves of this Answer.⁷⁴

While Charles II supported Christina in this controversy, he waited eagerly to hear from his agent Bellenden, who had undertaken a mission to Sweden. On his return, Bellenden reported that he secretly arranged financial and military support from Sir John Maclean, a wealthy Scottish merchant in Gothenburg, who had been knighted by Christina.⁷⁵ From Amsterdam Sir William Davidson managed the financial transactions with Maclean.⁷⁶ According to eighteenth-century Swedish Masonic tradition, a charter from Edinburgh was granted to a clandestine lodge in Gothenburg, probably in connection with the royalist collaboration of Maclean and the many Scots living in the port city.⁷⁷ However, the new king greatly disappointed Bellenden, who feared that the “transaction betwixt Sr. John Macklier [Maclean] and me” would be frustrated.⁷⁸ Bellenden offered to provide four thousand soldiers to Carl X in return for assistance to the Stuart cause, but Christina’s successor refused to entertain Bellenden “because he was a royalist.”

As the militaristic Swedish king planned to march into Germany and Poland, Charles II’s aunt Elizabeth—once the center of Rosicrucian fervor for a Swedish crusade—warned that “Sweden can have no blessing, by reason that he [Carl X] adhereth so much to Cromwell.”⁷⁹ To counter the English propaganda campaign against Christina and the royalist Jews, Charles II secretly supervised the publication of a Flemish pamphlet in which Cromwell and Carl X were portrayed as servants of the anti-Christ, whereas Christina had “risen up a saviour in the Theater of the World.”⁸⁰ Through her conversion to uni-

⁷⁴ D. Katz, “Menasseh,” 67.

⁷⁵ James Maclean, “Montrose’s Preparations for the Invasion of Scotland, and Royalist Missions to Sweden, 1649–1651,” in Ragnild Hatton and M.S. Anderson, eds., *Studies in Diplomatic History* (London: Longmans, 1970), 7–30.

⁷⁶ F. Routledge, *Calendar . . . Clarendon*, II, 432.

⁷⁷ Merzdorf, “Über die Grundverfassung der Grossen Landeslogen von Schweden d.d. 1800,” *Latomia*, 24 (1873), 29. On “die fraglichen Privilegien Carl’s XI,” see also “Geschichte der Freimaurer-brüderschaft in Schweden und Norwegen,” *Latomia*, 7 (1846), 175. The privilege given by Carl XI was for a previously existing lodge.

⁷⁸ E. Nicholas, *Nicholas Papers*, II, 77.

⁷⁹ J. Thurloe, *Collection*, V, 568.

⁸⁰ S. Akerman, *Christina*, 222–23.

versalist Catholicism, Christina would lead the restoration of Jews and Christians to Jerusalem—and the Stuarts to the British throne.

While Middleton was meeting with the Dutch Jews, he received new orders from Charles II to travel to Poland in order to raise funds from Scottish merchants in that nation, whose king had declared his devotion to the Stuart cause. Middleton probably planned to contact Dr. William Davison, the Scottish alchemist, who now served the Polish king and sent reports to the Stuart court about potential recruits among the Scots in the Polish army.⁸¹ As noted earlier, Dr. Davison was interested in Polish Rosicrucianism, and he was apparently a Freemason (perhaps initiated by his friend Moray). Before Middleton left for Poland, Charles II ordered him to commission the alchemist's kinsman, Sir William Davidson, to take over the Jewish negotiations in Amsterdam. In September 1656 Middleton gave Sir William a letter from the king:

Sr. William Davidson; Middleton will tell you what he is now going about, in which he will depend very much upon your advice, and the assistance you can give him, I shall say no more to you, but that I hope the time is drawing on, in which you will receive the fruit of all your labours, and of the affection which you have so constantly shewed to my service, I pray consider well of what Middleton says to you, and give him all the help you can, and engage as many of your friends in other places as you can to do the like, for which you and they shall receive the hearty thanks of [king's seal].⁸²

Through an examination of Sir William Davidson's relationships with Scottish exiles and various Jewish merchants (his "friends in other places") the first evidence of Scottish-Jewish Masonic collaboration will emerge.

The importance of securing the Stuart-Jewish alliance was intensified when Cromwell allowed a party of Jews to open a public synagogue in Creechurch Lane in early 1657. His permission was probably provoked by news of the royalist Jews's overture to Charles II in Holland. As in Ashmole's association with Franco, there was possibly a Masonic element in the Dutch developments. At this time, Charles sent Moray from Bruges to Holland, where as the king's "confidential agent" he maintained contact with Middleton and Davidson. In fact, Moray used Davidson's "boy" as a courier between Stuart agents in various

⁸¹ F. Routledge, *Calendar . . . Clarendon*, III, 173.

⁸² W. Samuel, "Davidson," 73-74.

Dutch cities.⁸³ During Moray's residence at The Hague and then Maastricht in 1657–60, he gathered intelligence and corresponded with royalists in Bremen, Paris, Edinburgh, and London. That he frequently added his Mason's Mark (a pentacle or Seal of Solomon) to his signature—while he utilized pseudonyms, ciphers, and invisible inks—suggests that Masonic links were utilized in the clandestine communication network.

One member of this network, Sir Robert Montgomerie, was kinned by marriage to Moray, through his mother-in-law Sophia Balcarres.⁸⁴ As a member of the Seton-Montgomerie family, who currently possessed the Schaw Statutes of 1599, Sir Robert was probably a Mason.⁸⁵ His father expressed the family's architectural interest by commissioning a fantastic monumental tomb, carved in stone and completed in 1639. The father—and apparently the sons—used this “temple” for ritualised meditation upon their impending deaths.⁸⁶ Could this practice be the root of the eighteenth-century *Écossais* usage of the “Chamber of Reflection,” where the candidate for initiation meditates on a skull and other symbolic implements and then writes his “Philosophic Will”?⁸⁷ Robert Montgomerie had earlier served with Moray and Middleton during the Glencairn Rising, and he was now a fellow-exile.

While Moray, Montgomerie, Balcarres, Davidson, and Middleton collaborated, their Dutch context sheds light on two provocative but puzzling events in Jewish-Masonic history—the initiation of a Jew into Freemasonry in Newport, Rhode Island, in 1658 and the designing of the Stuart Masons' coat of arms by a Jewish “brother” in 1675. From an examination of Moray's friendships and correspondence during his Dutch residence, facts emerge that lend plausibility to these two obscure and controversial affairs.

⁸³ Kincardine MS.5049.ff.3, 28, 44; MS.5050.ff.49, 55.

⁸⁴ Gerard Dielemans, “Een macconieke (liefde) brief uit Maastricht A.D. 1658,” *Acta Macionica*, 10 (2000), 180. I am grateful to Jan Snoek for sending me this article.

⁸⁵ Kincardine MS.5049.f.44; reference to “Robin” Montgomerie in December 1657. See summary of Schaw Statutes in “Report on the Muniments of the Right Honourable Archibald William Montgomerie, Earl of Eglinton and Winton, at Eglinton Castle,” *Tenth Report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1885), 29–30.

⁸⁶ D. Howard, *Scottish Architecture*, 203.

⁸⁷ Daniel Béreskniak, *Symbols of Freemasonry*, trans. Ian Monk (Paris: Editions Assouline, 1997), 22–24.

One of Moray's intimate friends in Holland was the Dutch savant Constantijn Huygens, secretary to the Prince of Orange, who had been knighted by James I during a 1622 diplomatic mission to England. A strong supporter of the Stuart cause, Huygens had worked with Moray's cousin William Murray and other royalist Scots in the 1640's, and he now shared with Moray and Balcarres an interest in the occult sciences.⁸⁸ Huygens had been a friend of Torrentius, the Rosicrucian painter protected by Charles I, and he collected rare treatises on Rosicrucianism, Hermeticism, and Cabalism. Some scholars argue that he was associated with a Rosicrucian society in Holland.⁸⁹ An erudite student of architecture, Huygens was inspired by Inigo Jones's designs and the Solomonic aspirations of the Stuart kings.⁹⁰ He worked closely with operative masons while designing his own Vitruvian house and contributing plans for the Mauritzhuis at The Hague.⁹¹ His frequent descriptions of God as "the Great Architect" suggest his Masonic mentality, and there is a controversial Dutch tradition that he belonged to a "lodge" in 1637–38.⁹²

Moray's correspondence with Constantijn and his son Christiaan, whom he met in spring 1658, reinforces the probability that they shared Masonic bonds, for he sealed his letters with his Mason's Mark.⁹³ Constantijn had political connections with the military governor of Maastricht, who sought Moray's architectural advice on the design and placement of the new town hall.⁹⁴ A year later Moray would be honored for his contribution by being made a citizen and member of the Maastricht "Craft of Masons." However, Moray may have administered Scottish-style Masonic initiations earlier; in February

⁸⁸ Ignaz Matthey, "De Beteknis van de Naturen," in Hans Bot, ed., *Constantijn Huygens: Zijn Plaats in Geleerd Europa* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam UP, 1973), 412–24.

⁸⁹ L.A. Langeveld, *Alchemisten en Rozekruizers* (Epe, 1926); cited in S. Akerman, *Rose Cross*, 146, 224–25.

⁹⁰ H.J. Louw, "Anglo-Netherlandish Architectural Exchange, c. 1600–c. 1660," *AH*, 24 (1981), 14–23.

⁹¹ Katherine Fremantle, *The Baroque Town Hall of Amsterdam* (Utrecht: Haentjens, Dekker, and Gambert, 1959), 97–109.

⁹² S. Akerman, *Rose Cross*, 146.

⁹³ Kincardine MS.5050.f.34, 44. On Moray's friendship with the Huygenses, father and son, see Constantijn Huygens, *Die Briefwisseling 1608–1687*, ed. J.A. Worp (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1911–18), 73, 114; Christiaan Huygens, *Oeuvres Complètes* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1888–1950), III, 322; IV, 130, 358; XXII, 576, 581; Rosalie Colie, *Some Thankfulness to Constantine* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1956), 26, 147.

⁹⁴ G. Dielemans, "Een maconnieke," 181–82.

1658 he asked Alexander Bruce, "Did you bring me any white woman's gloves from London," for a gift of gloves to the new member and his wife was a traditional requirement of the craft.⁹⁵

Constantijn Huygens also provided a possible link between his Scottish Masonic friends and the royalist Jews. He referred fondly to his Hebrew studies with Rabbi Leon (lessons which apparently took place in the 1650's), and he developed an enduring friendship with Leon, now widely known as the "architect" of the Temple and Tabernacle models.⁹⁶ As a confidante of Moray and Davidson (Charles II's agent to the Jews), Huygens probably introduced the Scots to Leon, who may have participated in the delegation of royalist Jews to their colleague Middleton.⁹⁷ The rabbi was often consulted by Christian and Jewish builders about proposed projects, and his own design of the Temple would influence that of the synagogue later constructed in Amsterdam. It is also possible that Leon was admitted to a guild of operative masons; as Bloom reports, "when a Jew was particularly proficient in his profession," the Amsterdam guilds "were forced to admit him."⁹⁸ If Leon received a Scottish-Stuart initiation, it could have been "outside" a lodge or in an "occasional" lodge meeting—two methods often used by Scots which unfortunately left no documentation.⁹⁹ When the rabbi later visited London to exhibit his Temple model, it was Huygens *père* who recommended him to several Masonic friends of Moray, and "Brother" Leon allegedly designed the coat of arms for the restored Stuart fraternity.

The evidence for Jewish-Masonic contact in Holland in the 1650's thus provides a credible historical context for a previously puzzling document which recorded a meeting of Jewish Masons in Newport, Rhode Island in 1658: "wee mett att y House of Mordecai Campunall and after Synagog Wee gave Abm Moses the degrees of Maconrie."¹⁰⁰ David Katz discusses the controversy that surrounds this rare (and now lost) document:

⁹⁵ Kincardine MS.5049.f.143 (1 February 1658); D. Stevenson, *Origin*, 46, 156; Robert Plot, *The Natural History of Staffordshire* (Oxford: The Theatre, 1686), 316–18.

⁹⁶ A. Shane, "Leon," 157.

⁹⁷ On Huygens's friendship with Sir William Davidson, see *Briefwisseling*, V, 383; VI, 229.

⁹⁸ Herbert Bloom, *The Economic Activities of the Jews of Amsterdam in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Williamsport: Bayard, 1937), 66–67.

⁹⁹ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 207.

¹⁰⁰ Samuel Oppenheim, *The Jews and Masonry in the United States Before 1810*. Rpt. from *Publications of American Jewish Historical Society*, 19 (1910), 11.

As might be expected, this Masonic document has placed both historians of Freemasonry and of American Jewry in an unenviable position. The early period of Freemasonry is still shrouded in mystery . . . Yet instead of jumping at a credible piece of evidence of the existence of speculative Freemasonry in the New World as early as 1656 or 1658, long before the formal establishment of Masonic lodges there, Masonic historians have instead chosen to ignore the possibility, no doubt reluctant to claim Jews as the first known Masons in America. Such early connections between Jews and Masons would hardly be surprising, given the strong kabbalistical, magical, and Hermetical associations of the movement in the seventeenth century, and the many later Jews who became Freemasons.

So too do Jewish historians shy away from accepting this Masonic document, no doubt because of an unwillingness to confirm that the first Jews in English America were Freemasons.¹⁰¹

Though some historians argue that the Jews came to Newport from Amsterdam or Jamaica, Katz believes they more likely came from Barbados, where they had been tolerated along with the Quakers. However, the Scottish connection of certain Jews in Barbados, as well as Amsterdam, suggests another explanation for the Masonic ceremony in 1658.

As noted earlier, Sir William Davidson and his Jewish partners maintained important trade connections with Barbados. In 1655 Cromwell sent a huge fleet to Barbados, where his officers impressed over four thousand men.¹⁰² He also banished many captured royalists, especially Scots and Irish, to the island. Stuart agents were pleased to report that the English navy created so much resentment in Barbados that even Cromwell began to fear that the local inhabitants "have imbraced our Kinges quarrell." Among the Dutch trading vessels seized by the English was the *Mary* of London, "owned by Sir William Davidson, taken at Barbados with five other Dutch ships."¹⁰³ Back in Holland, Moray—who utilized his Mason's Mark in correspondence with Davidson—lamented his colleague's losses in this affair.¹⁰⁴ The Scottish-Jewish enterprises were further threatened by English radicals, who determined to expand their military crusade against the Papist Anti-Christ onto the Continent. In 1657 the

¹⁰¹ D. Katz, *Sabbath*, 162–63.

¹⁰² E. Nicholas, *Nicholas Papers*, II, 200, 303, 346.

¹⁰³ W. Samuel, "Davidson," 44.

¹⁰⁴ Kincardine MS.5049.f.4.

Quaker leader George Fox rebuked Cromwell's army for its failure to attack Rome.¹⁰⁵

When Cromwell broke with Spain, he used Barbados as a base of operations against Spanish as well as Dutch ships. These new naval wars were especially threatening to Davidson and his Jewish agents, who managed considerable trade with Spain. With Barbados now under restrictive parliamentary control, Davidson's Jewish business associates on the island may have moved to Newport in order to take advantage of the renowned religious tolerance of the Rhode Island colony. Since Cromwell's government had rejected official Jewish readmission, the Jewish merchants identified with other proscribed religious groups, who sought economic and religious freedoms in the colony. However, as Gutstein observes, the early Jews in Newport "suffered as did all the colonists" under the increasingly harsh trade restrictions imposed from London.¹⁰⁶ Many of them looked back to the pre-Cromwellian period, when the king through his Privy Council provided the rules and regulations by which the various "Crown colonies" governed themselves.

Thus, in 1658, when certain Jews from Barbados and/or Amsterdam held a Masonic ceremony in Newport, their probable business associate Davidson was collaborating with Moray, an active Freemason, while Davidson placed his Dutch-Jewish trading enterprises at the service of Charles II, a "Mason King." From later evidence, it is clear that Mordecai Campunall, host of the Newport Masonic meeting, managed trade between Rhode Island and Barbados, and that his partners were royalist Jews.¹⁰⁷ Moreover, several Barbados Jews would be honored by the restored Charles II for their collaboration with Davidson. Even more intriguing, various kinsmen of Rabbi Leon were resident on the island, including one of his sons who became known as "Moses of Barbados." Did Moses carry his father's Temple traditions and alleged Masonic interests with him?

Rather than following the Quakers to Newport, the Dutch Jews may have sought relief from proselytizing efforts by the "Friends,"

¹⁰⁵ Christopher Hill, "Till the Conversion of the Jews," in Richard Popkin, ed., *Millenarianism and Messianism in English Literature and Thought, 1650-1800* (Leiden: Brill, 1988), 29.

¹⁰⁶ Morris Gutstein, *The Story of the Jews of Newport, 1658-1908* (New York: Bloch, 1936), 34.

¹⁰⁷ Wilfred Samuel, "A Review of the Jewish Colonies in Barbados in the Year 1680," *TJHSE*, 13 (1932-35), 16, 25-27, 44.

who had caused great disturbance in the synagogue at Amsterdam through their conversionist efforts in 1656–58. As one Quaker agent reported, "there are some among them that would willingly become Christians, but that they fear intollerable persecution, and that especially from their brethren."¹⁰⁸ In fact, the main Jew with Quaker interests was the heterodox philosopher Benedict Spinoza, who was excommunicated by the rabbinic authorities in 1656. Another conversionist effort was mounted by John Dury and Peter Serrarius, who raised funds for Rabbi Nathan Shapira, who had travelled from Jerusalem to Amsterdam in 1657.¹⁰⁹ Serrarius reported to Dury in London that Shapira's Cabalistic interpretations of *Isaiah* 53:4–5 convinced him that "I did not hear a Jew, but a Christian."

Dury published an account of Shapira's purported readiness to convert in *An Information, Concerning the Present State of the Jewish Nation in Europe and Judea* (London, 1658). In a marginal note, Dury observed, "These Cabalistical Notions, though to us they are no ground of Interpretation of Scripture; yet if to them they bring forth true Gospel conclusions, we have no cause to except against their using of them." He went on to discuss the Cabalistic notions of the *Sephiroth*, the seven celestial palaces, and the Holy of Holies in the Temple. However, Dury claimed that Shapira did not believe in an actual Jewish Temple but in a non-denominational spiritual Temple:

... the Temple, [is] not ours, that is, of man's building, but in his own Temple, which he [God] hath built in the heavens, and which he will let down from Heaven to earth ... his Temple was ordained for all the people of the Gentiles, who ever shall fear God in sincerity.¹¹⁰

This statement would certainly have displeased Rabbi Leon, whose architectural treatises were designed as practical guides to the actual rebuilding of the Temple in Jerusalem or even in Holland. Moreover, Leon opposed this type of over-spiritualizing of the Temple, typified earlier by Villalpando, which attempted to remove the Solomonic and Herodian Temples from actual Jewish history.

Even worse, Dury and Serrarius claimed that some Jews confessed that their fore-fathers did wickedly in killing Jesus, and they were ready to convert. Because Jews knew that Jesus was condemned by

¹⁰⁸ M. Gutstein, *Story of Jews*, 59–60.

¹⁰⁹ R. Popkin, "Hartlib, Dury, and the Jews," 130–32.

¹¹⁰ [John Dury], *An Information, Concerning the Present State of the Jewish Nation* (London: Brewster, 1658), 12–14.

Roman not Jewish law, this statement must have seemed absurd to the Jewish authorities in Holland. Though the Christian proselytizers raised funds for the relief of distressed Jews in Poland and Palestine, Shapira's tactics angered the rabbis in Amsterdam and Jerusalem. Popkin notes that "some cynics have suggested that Shapira's philo-Christian views were just a means of securing money from Gentiles," which led to his condemnation by the rabbinical authority when he returned to Jerusalem.¹¹¹ Dury gave Shapira a copy of the New Testament with a charge to have it translated into Hebrew, but nothing materialized of this plan. Shapira stayed in touch with the Christian millenarians, while he allegedly made "very un- and even anti-Christian remarks" in his unpublished sermons.

This uncomfortable context of conversionist attempts in Holland, undertaken by supporters of Cromwell, explains why many Jews viewed Charles II as a more attractive instrument of tolerance. It was probably in 1656 that Sir William Davidson befriended Rabbi Jacob Abendana, a former Marrano in Spain who reclaimed his Jewish identity in Amsterdam.¹¹² From Abendana's later panegyric to Davidson, it is clear that the Stuart agent was not a conversionist and that his acceptance of Jews as Jews was appreciated in the Jewish community. In fact, it was anger at the aggressive attempt by Antonius Hulsius, a Leiden professor, to convert Abendana that led him to produce a Spanish translation of Yehudah Halevi's twelfth-century philosophical work, *The Kuzari*, which he dedicated to Davidson in 1663.

As discussed in Chapter One, *The Kuzari* revealed Halevi's method of "visual thinking" and featured architectural imagery that would be attractive to Scottish Freemasons. In his dedication, Abendana clearly identified Davidson with the exiled Scottish royalist party (he called him "Conservator and Resident over his [Charles II's] subjects of his ancient Kingdom [Scotland] in the 17 Provinces" of Holland).¹¹³ While praising his friend for his loyalty to the Stuart king, he assumed that Davidson would welcome this "wholly intellectual and scientific" work, in which Jewish traditions and laws were unapologetically presented as authentic, enduring, and admirable.

¹¹¹ R. Popkin, "Hartilib, Dury, and the Jews, 132.

¹¹² David Katz, "The Abendana Brothers and the Christian Hebraists of Seventeenth-Century England," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 40 (1989), 28–52.

¹¹³ W. Samuel, "Davidson," 40–41, 65–66.

This praise for the Scottish royalist's tolerance and, more importantly, respect for Jewish beliefs sheds light on the unusually strong Jewish traditions within the earliest lodges in the North American colonies. If Davidson's Jewish business associates introduced Scottish-style Masonry into Newport, it would form one of the more colorful chapters in the saga of the "Judeo-Scots." In the eighteenth-century, Jews in the American colonies were most attracted to the "ancient" Scottish rite, which offered high degrees involving elaborate Hebraic, Cabalistic, and Stuart (Jacobite) symbolism.¹¹⁴ As they became not only priests of the Temple but Scottish Masters, the Jewish brethren were playing parts in a Masonic drama that probably began in Amsterdam in the 1650's.

From Moray's correspondence with another Scottish exile, it is clear that he considered studies in Jewish architectural, mathematical, and mystical lore to be essential to his Masonic philosophy. Did Davidson introduce Moray to his Jewish friends, such as Jacob Abendana? Certainly, the latter's interest in Halevi's "visual thinking" would find reinforcement in Scottish Masonic traditions about the Art of Memory and visualization of the Temple. We will return to Abendana's translation of *The Kuzari*, when we examine Moray's techniques of meditation, which bore a striking resemblance to those advocated by Halevi. Because secrecy and loyalty were essential to the royalists' restoration efforts, the Jewish contributors to the project may have been "bonded" by mystical vows and Solomonic brotherhood to their Scottish collaborators.

It is possible that Moray's mentor in Jewish studies was Rabbi Leon, the Hebrew instructor of Constantijn Huygens, who was their mutual friend. Importantly, Moray shared with Leon an interest in the science of heraldry, which both men related to Freemasonry.¹¹⁵ In Moray's correspondence of 1657–60, his discussion of Masonic heraldic symbolism—within a context of Cabalistic and Hermetic research—forms the only extant record of the interior life of a seventeenth-century Freemason.¹¹⁶ Whether his beliefs represent a

¹¹⁴ S. Oppenheim, "Jews and Masonry," 41, 76–87.

¹¹⁵ For Leon's heraldic studies, see Lucien Wolf, "Anglo-Jewish Coats of Arms," *TJHSE* (1894–95), 156–57.

¹¹⁶ Though Ashmole's diary contains some hints at his spiritual reflections, it largely records his external life. Moreover, he does not explicitly express his Masonic beliefs.

tradition that he learned within the lodges or whether he contributed a new or revitalized tradition remains an open question.

Moray's letters were written to Alexander Bruce, grandson of Sir George Bruce of Culross, whose probable Masonic affiliation was discussed earlier.¹¹⁷ In 1623 Moray visited the great underwater coal mine at Culross, which featured extensive stoneworks built by local masons, and he may have visited "The Palace," where the Solomonian wall-painting of James I allegedly featured Masonic symbolism. After the senior Bruce's death in 1625, his son George commissioned the masons to create a magnificent Jacobean monument in honor of his father.¹¹⁸ Alexander Bruce, second son of George *filis*, was driven from Scotland and took up residence in Swedish-controlled Bremen in 1657–58. Writing from Holland, Moray tried to console Alexander for his losses by encouraging his studies in Jewish lore, Hermetic chemistry, Paracelsan medicine, Egyptian hieroglyphics, and Masonic symbolism. In one letter Moray hinted (in his usual elliptical language) at the Masonic connections of Bruce's "godfather," which suggests Bruce's earlier and hereditary interest in the esoteric side of the craft. In a teasing tone, Moray wrote, if "you had conjured me rather as your Godfather did his Master, not to divulge to prophane such a transcendent Science, unless it were in hieroglyphicks," he would not have indulged in certain revelations.¹¹⁹ The term "prophane" would later be applied to non-initiates of *Écossais* Masonry.¹²⁰

In January 1658 Moray referred obliquely to his Hebrew studies, noting that he loved to learn "the very Alphabets of things I know," but neither he nor Bruce could yet "be saluted as Rabbi."¹²¹ In February he praised the ancient Jews for possessing more profound conceptions of cosmology than contemporary "Naturalists," for "the Hebrewes, bolder of old and more conversant in those speculations than now, say many fine things." Moray was particularly interested in medieval Jewish theories of geometry, astronomy, and cosmology, which suggests his probable interest in Abendana's current work on Halevi. In April he affirmed, "I take more delight in both great Masters in the orientall Tongues, chiefly the Jewish writings." He

¹¹⁷ Unfortunately, Bruce's letters to Moray are lost.

¹¹⁸ J. Paul, *Scots Peerage*, III, 484–86.

¹¹⁹ Kincardine MS.5049.f.88 (20 January 1658).

¹²⁰ K. Mackenzie, *Royal Masonic*, 579.

¹²¹ For the following quotes, see Kincardine MS.5049. ff.117, 151; MS.5050.f.28.

also recommended the works of Christian Hebraists such as Drusius—especially *De Nomine Tetragrammaton*, *De Tribus Elochim*, and commentaries on Genesis. Moray lamented that Sixtinus Amama had been cut short in his *Anti-Barbarus Biblicus* (1628), for his learned writings on the Jewish Cabala and its development in Reuchlin's *De Verbo Mirifico* were most illuminating.

Moray's readings in Drusius and Amama provided rare information on the ancient Jewish roots of masonic guilds. Drawing on Talmudic, Mishnaic, and Cabalistic sources, Drusius discussed the building of Solomon's Temple and noted that "Hoc sensu Salomo et Hiram fratres fuerunt. Siquidem fraternam amicitiam inter fe colebant."¹²² From his additional studies in Paul of Burgos and Nicholas of Lyra, Drusius disagreed with Villalpando and argued that the Essenes and Hasidim belonged to a religious guild that built the Herodian Temple. Attacked as a heretic and Arminian by strict Calvinists, he was defended by his friend Joseph Scaliger, who compared the Jewish building fraternities to contemporary "*Gilde-Broeder*" or "*Broederschap*."¹²³ All of these tracts were edited and published together by Sixtinus Amama, who defended the theses of Drusius and Scaliger about the Jewish building guilds, while adding information from the *Zohar*, Pico, Reuchlin, and Montano on the magical Tetragrammaton, the androgynous Adam Kadmon, the male and female dynamics of Hebrew letters and numbers, and the cosmic significance of the Temple architecture.¹²⁴ It was perhaps through Moray's influence that the theories of Drusius, Scaliger, and Amama were assimilated into Scottish Masonic tradition.¹²⁵

To further inform Bruce about Jewish traditions, Moray recommended the encyclopedic works of Johan Alsted, who undertook a Baconian reform of the mnemonic and visualization techniques of Lull and Bruno.¹²⁶ Moray noted that Alsted's *Encyclopaedia* (1630) was divided into speculative and practical sections, and it is curious that the latter included a long section entitled "Mnemonicam," which

¹²² Joannes Drusius, *Ad Minerval Serarii Responsio*, 19; published in volume entitled *Elohim sive de nomine Dei* (Frankerae, 1604).

¹²³ Joseph Scaliger, *Elenchus Trihaeressii Nicolaus Serrarius*, 30; published in Amama's edition of Drusius's *De Tribus Sectis Judaerorum* (1619).

¹²⁴ Sixtini Amama, *Anti-Barbarus Biblicus* (Amsterdam: Henry Laurentium, 1628), part I, 197, 323, 328; part 2, 473, 501.

¹²⁵ See discussion in A. Lawrie, *History*, 33–39.

¹²⁶ Kincardine MS.5050.ff.20, 28; R. Lull, *Selected Works*, 83.

gave a clear, methodical, illustrated explication of Cabalistic visionary techniques.¹²⁷ Moray had earlier lamented to Bruce that he had a “bad memory,” which would make studies in the mnemonic arts valuable to him, but he also boasted of possessing a “wilde fancy”—in the sense of being able to visualize things.¹²⁸ The “hieroglyphic” arts of Lull were considered by Alsted to be a part of “Theosophia et Philosophia Salomonis.”¹²⁹ For Moray, these Jewish techniques of vision must have seemed similar to the Scottish capacity for “second sight,” which was considered politically useful in these troubled times.

As noted earlier, Moray witnessed the prediction of his wife’s death by a second-sighted servant, and he was probably familiar with the Scottish Masons’ claim to possess the visionary art. From his collaborator Middleton, he learned about the prophecy made by a second-sighted Highlander that Charles I would be executed but his son would be restored after several failed attempts.¹³⁰ As a friend of Marmaduke Langdale, Moray was also aware of Langdale’s conversion via “an Italian conjuring, second-sighted glass” (Moray’s phrase).¹³¹ He now shared with Bruce an interest in the prophecies of “Thomas the Rhymer,” the thirteenth-century Scottish seer and poet who was associated with Wallace’s rebellion against the English invaders.¹³² Moray noted that Bruce’s “friend” the Rhymer announced that “Monarchs that was dead and buried shall be restored,” which he interpreted to mean the impending downfall of Cromwell and restoration of the Stuarts.

Moray also hinted to Bruce that he practised Jewish meditation techniques, which could produce states of prophetic vision. He was reported to spend “many hours a day in a devotion which was of a most elevating strain.”¹³³ Each evening he reviewed the day and celebrated “such of the divine attributes as appeared to him in the new occurrences of providence.” Through Davidson and Abendana,

¹²⁷ Johann Heinrich Alsted, *Encyclopaedia* (Herborn, 1630; facs. rpt. Stuttgart: Friedrich Frommann, 1989), IV, 1959–2273.

¹²⁸ Kincardine MS.5049.ff.72–73.

¹²⁹ J. Alsted, *Encyclopaedia*, IV, 2324, 2351.

¹³⁰ J. Aubrey, *Miscellanies*, 79.

¹³¹ Kincardine MS.5049.f.129; MS.5050.f.57.

¹³² *Ibid.*, MS.5049.f.62; see “Erceldoune, Thomas of, called also the Rhymer and Learmont,” *DNB*.

¹³³ Gilbert Burnet, *Burnet’s History of My Own Time*, ed. Osmund Airy (Oxford: Clarendon, 1897), I, 105; D. Stevenson, “Masonry,” 426.

he may have learned of Halevi's meditative method, which enabled the "pious man" to rise above circumstances and reach spiritual equanimity. In the *Kuzari* Halevi explained:

... every word [of prayer] is uttered thoughtfully and attentively. This moment forms the heart and fruit of his time, whilst the other hours represent the way which leads to it. He looks forward to its approach, because while it lasts he resembles the spiritual beings, and is removed from merely animal existence... During prayer he purges his soul from all that passed over it, and prepares it for the future... His soul frees itself from the whisperings of imagination, wrath, and lust, and neither in thought or deed gives them any attention.¹³⁴

Halevi's next stages of prayer were poignantly relevant to the exiled Scots, for the pious man should pray "for the reunion of the scattered," for "the re-appearance of justice and restoration of the former condition," and for "the return to Jerusalem, which again is to form the seat of the Divine Influence."

At its summit Halevi's method could produce "the visible revelation of the *Shekinah* just as she appeared to the prophets," and the meditator "imagines the *Shekinah* standing opposite to him." Wolfson notes that this visualization produces psycho-sexual pleasure:

... it appears that seeing the *Shekinah* is not a purely mental vision, but involves some corporeal shape or tangible form—if only in imagination—usually described as luminous in nature, as is attested, for example, by the idiom... "to derive pleasure from the splendor of the Presence"... the vision of the divine Presence involves an intensely erotic encounter.¹³⁵

Moray hinted to Bruce about his similar practice of sublimation and visualization: "I find Isaac's way of Meditation, Gen. 24, 63, as proper as any other posture and use it more often. If you would have more of this chalk it up." In his choice of dusk for his meditation session, Moray followed Cabalistic teaching in which that hour was dedicated by Isaac to the second pillar of *Gevurah* ("reflections and judgement").¹³⁶ In the verse cited by Moray, Isaac "went out to meditate in the field at eventide" and thus approached Rebekah, whom he took to his tent and married. Moray seemed to allude to

¹³⁴ J. Halevi, *Kuzari*, ed. Slonimsky, 139–40, 158,

¹³⁵ E. Wolfson, *Speculum*, 42.

¹³⁶ Zev ben Shimon Halevi, *The Way of Kabbalah* (New York: Samuel Weiser, 1976), 181.

the Cabalistic purpose of meditation on the *sephiroth* (the divine attributes), which can produce an ecstatic vision of the *Shekinah* (the cosmic bride). That he actually practised this meditation is suggested by his coy boast to Bruce that he knew the secret of marital bliss. He may have learned about Isaac's method of meditation from Henry Vaughan, whose 1650 poem, "Isaacs Marriage, Gen. Ca. 24, ver. 63," was re-published in 1655.

Moray hinted at the psychosexual meditation process in the context of his Masonic instruction of Bruce, which suggests a possible influence from Colonna's *Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* as well as Cabalistic sources. As noted earlier, Drummond of Hawthornden—the intimate friend of important Scottish Masons—owned the English edition, while Henry Vaughan drew upon its erotic-architectural theosophy in his poem, "Vanity of the Spirit."¹³⁷ Unlike his brother Thomas, who was daringly explicit in his use of Cabalistic sexual symbolism, Henry was so reticent about his Jewish sources that they would have been imperceptible to the non-illuminated.¹³⁸ However, the visionary process and its ecstatic culmination in a vision of the *Shekinah* would have been clear to any student of Jewish mysticism—and perhaps to readers of the *Hypnerotomachia*.

Henry Vaughan's poem on "Isaacs Marriage" begins with the Biblical quote: "and Isaac went out to pray in the field at the Eventide, and he lift up his eyes, and saw, and behold, the Camels were coming." Henry then contrasted Isaac's visionary capacity with the deteriorated spiritual condition of the church in England:

Praying! and to be married? It was rare,
 But now 'tis monstrous; and that pious care
 Though of our selves, is so much out of date,
 That to renew't it were to degenerate.
 But thou a Chosen sacrifice wert given,
 And offer'd up so early unto heaven
 Thy flames could not be out; Religion was
 Ray'd into thee, like beams into a glasse,
 Where, as thou grewst, it multipli'd and shin'd
 The sacred Constellation of thy mind.
 But being for a bride, sure, prayer was
 Very strange stuffe wherewith to court thy lasse.¹³⁹

¹³⁷ F. Colonna, *Hypnerotomachia*, xvi–xvii.

¹³⁸ Compare Thomas Vaughan, in *Works*, 72, 120–21, 523.

¹³⁹ H. Vaughan, *Works*, II, 408–10.

Scorning the carnality of the "Antick crowd," who were ignorant of the possibility of mystical marriage, Henry painted a serene scene of meditation which enables Isaac to envision his marriage with Rebekah, his earthly wife, who also embodies his heavenly bride, the *Shekinah*:

All was here smooth as thy bride
And calm like her, or that mild Evening-tide;
Yet, hadst thou nobler guests: Angels did wind
And rove about thee, guardians of thy minde,
These fetch'd thee home thy bride, and all the way
Advis'd thy servant what to do, and say;
These taught him at the well, and thither brought
The Chast, and lovely object of thy thought; . . .

.....
And now thou knewest her coming, It was time
To get thee wings on, and devoutly climbe
Unto thy God, for Marriage of all states
Makes most unhappy, or most fortunates;
This brought thee forth, where now thou didst undress
Thy soul, and with new pinions refresht
Her wearied wings, which so restor'd did flye
Above the stars, a track unknown, and high,
And in her piercing flight perfum'd the ayer
Scattering the Myrrhe, and incense of thy pray'r.

This poem would be especially meaningful to Thomas Vaughan, whose beloved wife Rebecca collaborated in his alchemical experiments and was possibly an initiate of Henshaw's Hermetic college.¹⁴⁰

Given Moray's Cabalistic studies and probable Jewish friends in 1658, it seems likely that he was aware of passages in the *Zohar* which interpreted Isaac's meditation and marriage. With the Temple destroyed and the Israelites dispersed into many nations, the members of the Zoharic mystical fraternity discussed the command given to post-exilic Jews that they must prepare a special house or room for prayer. When some replied that Isaac was allowed to go out in the field to meditate, the teacher explained:

It is an obligation to build a sanctuary below on the pattern of the Temple above . . . and to pray within it every day in order to serve the Holy One . . . And as for the synagogue, one must build it in the most beautiful fashion, and adorn it with every kind of adornment,

¹⁴⁰ D. Dickson, *Tessera*, 196, 202.

for the synagogue below matches the synagogue above . . . The Temple that King Solomon built was a house of repose on the celestial pattern, with all its adornments, so that there might be in the restored world above a house of repose and rest . . .

You might say [that one should fix a place for prayer] in a field as well, so that the spirit can ascend. But this is not right. A house is essential . . . to enable the upper abode to descend to the lower abode, and [in the open air] there is none. Moreover, both prayer and spirit have to ascend directly to Jerusalem from a narrow, confined place . . .

You might object by quoting, "And Isaac went out to meditate in the field" (Genesis 24:64). But Isaac was different, for he was in a different and unique situation . . . because he prayed in a different "field."¹⁴¹

The editors of the Zoharic passage, Lachower and Tishby, make clear that the point of Isaac's prayer—and that of his exiled descendants—was stimulation of the divine marriage: "when he prayed, Isaac concentrated on union with *Shekinah*, who is called 'field' because the influence of the *sefirot* is 'sown' in her." For Moray, who had lost a beloved wife, the Cabalistic technique for transmuting sexual arousal into spiritual euphoria would be a great comfort. As a widower he remained loyal to his wife's memory and maintained his chastity. As we shall see, he would later attempt a spiritual friendship (or Cabalistic "marriage"?) with a daughter of the Balcarres family. Thus, further Zoharic interpretation of Isaac's meditation sheds light on Moray's renowned "Stoicism" or capacity to maintain a cheerful equanimity.

Though all Jews were commanded to marry and to honor the *Shekinah* through reverent intercourse with their wives, the Cabalists were taught how to achieve "celestial intercourse" when they were separated from their wives on weekdays in order to study the Hebrew scriptures.¹⁴² While performing the afternoon prayer of Isaac, the adept must purify his intentions and concentrate his mind on the *sephirotic* process (the dynamics of the divine attributes), until he is able to elevate his thoughts and raise the *Shekinah* to the Holy One. It was said of Isaac that "the man waited for her silently" or "the man looked steadfastly on her." In earthly intercourse, this means that the man delays ejaculation until the woman reaches orgasm, which will bring down a holy soul upon the wife and ensure a male

¹⁴¹ F. Lachower, *Wisdom of the Zohar*, IV, 1017–18.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, IV, 1398, 1053–54.

child. In celestial intercourse, the man delays ejaculation completely, so that an orgasmic state is achieved without seminal emission (a technique similar to Tantric yoga). When Moray remarked coyly to Bruce, who was then seeking a wife, that he could discourse at great length on how to find happiness in married life, did he allude to the techniques of earthly and celestial intercourse?¹⁴³

On 2 April 1658 Moray revealed more secrets of his own spiritual development, and he hinted that further progress in mastering the mysteries of Freemasonry could provide Bruce with similar profound experiences:

... till then, I shall tell you it hath been my study now 31 years to understand and regulate my passions; the whole story of my progress in this, and god's dealings with me in it, would be as open to you as you would have it, and as all the other secret corners of my soul will be when you have a mind to look into them . . . I may perhaps find a wile to . . . hold you as fast as if you were biggit [built] in a Tower of stone and lime. Before you come in cheek by jowl with me at building Castles in the Air, you must be first prentice as I was, then Mr. Mason as I am, and produce a Master piece as I did; till then be content to be a good Barrowman, and be not so saucy as to talk Jock fellow lyke. You need not be feared the Hott [hod] with the mortar be too heavy for your weak back; nor the stones gar [make] your armes crack. The materials I employ when I build Castles in the Air are of a stuff that is neither heavy nor hard, yet looks so bonny as if it were all red burning gold when it is once finished, and if you prove docile, and I guess you will, I may perhaps let you try your hand on such a chimney piece as you talk of, after you are once bound prentice . . . You encroach upon my gardening as well as upon my Masonerie . . . Here I will admit more calmly of your brotherhood . . .¹⁴⁴

From this remarkable letter, it is clear that Moray and Bruce utilized their initiation in operative masonry to make progress in spiritual Freemasonry. In order to become a Master Mason, Moray actually constructed a "Master piece" and other architectural models, and Bruce would later design chimney pieces as well as more complex residential and technological buildings. Garden design was also considered part of a mason's repertoire of skills. However, the "Castles in the Air" were made of the visionary "red burning gold" achieved by "metaphysicall alchimy." After giving Bruce the ritualistic

¹⁴³ A. Robertson, *Moray*, 178.

¹⁴⁴ Kincardine MS.5050. ff.3-7.

Masonic embrace of recognition and brotherhood—i.e., “cheek by jowl”—Moray would instruct him further in the secrets of mystical vision and fraternity.

Moray’s veiled advice to Bruce that he should practice Isaac’s method of meditation came in the context of concern about his friend’s health, and it is noteworthy that both Cabalistic and Rosicrucian adepts believed that their ritual practices improved health and increased longevity. As he had earlier with Alexander Hamilton, a fellow Mason, Moray recommended to Bruce the works of Marcus Marci, who developed Rosicrucian-style theories of medicine. It was perhaps at Moray’s request that the imprisoned Lauderdale asked Dr. John Worthington (a Hermetic friend of Hartlib) to procure a rare copy of Marci’s *De Linea Sphygmica* “for another nobleman beyond the sea.”¹⁴⁵ Marci drew on Cabalistic and Lullist teachings to develop geometrised concepts of human and cosmic sexuality and generation, which he applied in his medical practice.¹⁴⁶ He even had unusual access to the sexual-meditation-medical practices of Chinese and Tibetan *yoga* (which influenced the sexual theosophy of the Cabala).

Much of Moray’s correspondence is taken up with discussions of the symbolism of his Mason’s Mark (the pentacle or Seal of Solomon) and his heraldic seal (a star crest with the motto *Esse quam videri*, “to be rather than to appear or seem.”¹⁴⁷ The motto was a variation of Tycho Brahe’s *Non haberi sed esse*, “not to seem, but to be,” which was carved above the allegorical figures in Uraniborg and which was well-known in Scotland. In Stuart culture, heraldry was closely related to architecture, with both considered the provenance of Freemasonry.¹⁴⁸ Given Rabbi Leon’s studies in heraldry and his later usage of Jewish mystical symbolism in his design for a Masonic coat of arms, it is tempting to speculate on his possible influence on Moray’s theories.¹⁴⁹ Following Masonic techniques of graduated levels of initiation, Moray hinted to Bruce at a graduated revelation of the secrets of heraldry and hieroglyphics:

¹⁴⁵ Hartlib Papers, 129/7/1A–16B. Ephemerides, part 3 (May–October 1658).

¹⁴⁶ Kincardine MS.5050.f.33; see Marcus Marci à Kronland, *Idearum Opreraticum* (Prague, 1635), and *Liturgia mentis seu Disceptatio Medica, Philosophica, et Optica*, ed. Jacobus Dobrzinsky (Ratisbone, 1678).

¹⁴⁷ D. Stevenson, “Masonry,” 413–14.

¹⁴⁸ See V. Hart, “A Peece,” 53–66.

¹⁴⁹ L. Wolf, “Anglo-Jewish Coats of Arms,” 156–57.

Here I mean but to play the quarrier, and will hereafter help you play the Mason . . . If you honor your Brothers Coronat and Cask with my Masons Mark, I can tell you many fine things about it, which I will forebear till you bid me tell them . . . let me recommend to you Aldrovandus' works, which present you with formes of all living creatures, plants etc. most amply . . . But if you would look into the theatre of Hieroglyphicks, let me recommend to you . . . Kircher, Oedipus Aegyptiacus, and his Obeliscus Pamphilius . . .¹⁵⁰

In Ulisse Aldrovandi's thirteen-volume natural history, each animal and plant was explicated within a vast web of correspondences drawn from mythology, hieroglyphics, statuary, heraldry, etc.—constituting "the most flagrant expression of an emblematic world view" in which every thing in the cosmos has "a myriad of hidden meanings."¹⁵¹ Small wonder that John Dee sought out Aldrovandi in 1563. More important, however, were two works by Kircher, whom Moray called "an epistolar acquaintance of mine," in which the Jesuit polymath drew on neo-Platonic, Hermetic, and Cabalistic traditions to explicate the Egyptian hieroglyphs. Kircher may have been aware of Moray's Masonic affiliation, for Moray later used his Masons' Mark to identify himself in a letter to the Jesuit.¹⁵² Because many theories and emblems from Kircher's works turn up in later Masonic documents, it will be useful to briefly examine the actors and scenarios in his "theatre of Hieroglyphicks."

In *Obeliscus Pamphilius* (1650), Kircher drew on the restoration work he undertook on a fallen obelisk that was to be re-erected in front of the Palazzo Pamphili. He argued that the pyramids of Giza dated from antediluvian times and that Hermes Trismegistus was the inventor of the hieroglyphs found there. In passages relevant to Moray's Mason's Mark, he then explicated the figure of an X, which symbolized the procession of the Anima Mundi to the inferior realms, and its return. As Godwin explains

The X formation can be developed in two ways: first, it can be compressed to form two intersecting triangles, making the hexagonal star known as Solomon's Seal. Second, the two lines can extend and interpenetrate to give the symbol of intersecting pyramids. Originally

¹⁵⁰ Kincardine MS.5049.ff.137–40.

¹⁵¹ W.B. Ashworth, quoted in Hakan Hakansson, *Seeing the Word: John Dee and Renaissance Occultism* (Lund: Uggla Minervaserien, 2001), 153, 157.

¹⁵² Henry Oldenburg, *The Correspondence of Henry Oldenburg*, eds. A.R. Hall and M.B. Hall (Madison: Wisconsin UP, 1973), VI, 422.

suggested by Nicholas of Cusa, this latter became a favorite symbol of Robert Fludd's dualistic metaphysics, elaborated by him into a veritable "Science of Pyramids."¹⁵³

Though Moray laughingly remarked that he had probably given Bruce "a belly full" of explication of his emblems, his friend would find even more esoterica in the second recommended book by Kircher.

In *Oedipus Aegyptiacus* (1652–54), Kircher greatly expanded his explanations, justifying his arguments by a list of authorities on the title-page: "Egyptian wisdom, Phoenecian theology, Chaldaean astrology, Greek theosophy, Mythology, Arabian alchemy, Latin philology." Godwin notes that Kircher scorned the Hebrews from Moses's time onwards as betrayers of Egyptian wisdom ("incorrigible idolators and fornicators, perverters of the Egyptian fertility cult into crude phallic worship"), but he also presented one of the most complete treatises on Cabala yet written by a non-Jew.¹⁵⁴ Drawing on the *Sepher Yetzirah* and *Zohar*, Kircher infused cosmic sexual symbolism into his geometric hieroglyphs. Thus, "Amor Mundi" is the magnetic force that binds the universe together, the origin of all conceivable skills, and the contemplative object of the true Magi. In a section on "Hieroglyphic Geometry," he combined the intersecting pyramids with the "Sphere of Empedocles," turned by love and strife, while a "ray of love" causes the cosmos to move on its axis. Despite his criticism of the post-Mosaic Jews, Kircher's diagrams replicated the sephirotic tree and his cosmology was essentially Cabalistic.¹⁵⁵ While Moray gradually instructed his Scottish protégé in the mysteries of Masonry, Bruce was provided with a veritable encyclopedia of the occult traditions.

Moray was also aware of Kircher's interest in secret modes of communication. He had read earlier of the Jesuit's belief in magnetic transmission of telepathic messages, and he now informed Bruce that "Kircherus is a master at the telling of one's genius, by seeing only their handwriting, as a gipsy can do by looking at their loof [palm of the hand]."¹⁵⁶ In *Oedipus Aegyptiacus*, Kircher gave a rare

¹⁵³ Joscelyn Godwin, "Athanasius Kircher and the Occult," in J. Fletcher, *Kircher*, 30–31.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 57.

¹⁵⁵ See especially *Oedipus Aegyptiacus* (Romae, 1652–54), I, 151; II, 209–90; III, 3, 108–12.

¹⁵⁶ O. Airy, "Correspondence," 35.

discussion of the Cabalistic significance of different finger positions, and it is possible that the increasingly elaborate "signs and tokens" (gestures and postures) of seventeenth-century Freemasons were influenced by his revelations. In the section entitled "Theatrum Hieroglyphicum," which drew heavily on Cabalistic theories, Kircher featured a huge fold-out engraving of the "Tabula Isiaca," which Cardinal Bembo had saved from the sack of Rome in 1527.¹⁵⁷ Kircher studied the tablet for years, and he ultimately utilized a sephirotic scheme to interpret the elaborate illustrations (complete with human, animal, and plant figures). Like the coded finger positions, the Isiac figures displayed symbolic positions of arms, legs, feet, etc., which would later emerge in Masonic identification rituals.

There is no mention of Kircher's *Itinerarium Exstaticum* (1656) in Moray's surviving letters, but it seems likely that he read it, for he kept up with all the Jesuit's works. Constantijn Huygens owned the book and shared Moray's interest in Kircher's theosophy.¹⁵⁸ A strangely poetic version of Kircher's "Contemplative Magic," this ecstatic journey was based on a dream inspired by a sublime performance of three lutenists. Given Moray's interest in visionary meditation and the science of music, Kircher's account of a cosmological voyage was strikingly relevant to his current studies. The author, as "Theodidactus" (Taught by God), was led by the angel Cosmiel on a journey through the regions of moon, sun, and planets.¹⁵⁹ Using geometrical diagrams, Kircher described "the Soul's downward and upward journeys," which reproduce on the microcosmic level the original descent of the Monad into multiplicity. He drew heavily on Lull's complex diagrams, and much of his visionary technique resembled Lull's development of the Art of Memory.

Throughout his writings, Moray stressed the importance of experiment, whether he meant the *felt* experience of a visionary state or the practical proof of a scientific theory. Like Kircher, he was willing to extract the best thought out of a plethora of eclectic traditions, while he subjected their claims to experimental verification. Thus, there was no contradiction in his maintaining seven chemical stills and furnaces in his laboratory at Maastricht, where he worked

¹⁵⁷ A. Kircher, *Oedipus*, III, 79–83; reproduced in Joscelyn Godwin, *Athanasius Kircher: A Renaissance Man and the Quest for Lost Knowledge* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1979), 65.

¹⁵⁸ Constantijn Huygens, *Catalogus*, 35.

¹⁵⁹ J. Godwin, "Kircher and Occult," 30.

hard to produce medicinal drugs and mineralogical products, while at the same time speculating on “metaphysical alchemy.” Moray boasted that he was now “courted by his fellow Apothecaries,” who wanted to learn about his chemical products.¹⁶⁰ He was especially influenced by the teachings of Johann Rudolph Glauber, who established a famous chemical lab in Amsterdam. When Moray recommended three books by Glauber to Bruce, he praised the German as “a renowned alchemist.”

A Catholic who moved to Protestant Amsterdam in 1655, Glauber shared the eclectic tolerance of Kircher and Moray, and he abhorred the use of force in the name of religion. During the period when Moray was in contact with him, Glauber experienced a spiritual illumination based on his discovery of *sal mirabile*, a crystallized sodium carbonate that became known as “Glauber’s Salt.” Heavily influenced by Sendivogius, Glauber also drew on Dr. William Davison’s mystical interpretations of salt. Anticipating a visit from Bruce, Moray wrote that “We shall philosophise more upon our salts when God brings us together.” When he wanted some of Glauber’s salts, Moray used Sir William Davidson as an intermediary. Glauber also practised “secret alchemy,” in which he believed that he was the new Elias, long ago prophesied by Paracelsus. In *Miraculum Mundi* (1653–57), a work praised by Moray to Bruce, Glauber hinted that through his own work with salts, alchemy would begin to flourish and usher in a new chemical apocalypse.¹⁶¹ Such pronouncements led many to believe he was a Rosicrucian.

Despite Glauber’s millenarial tone, he argued that the great predicted changes would usher in practical improvements in men’s lives, especially through improved agricultural techniques, metallurgical processes, and medicinal drugs. Given his influence on Moray, there is Masonic relevance in his belief that the increase in prosperity would dissolve the differences between men so that true equality would prevail. Though Scottish Freemasonry had long boasted that the king stood on the level with his masons, the increasing stress on equality within the lodges—that emerged so powerfully in the next century—may have reflected developments among the exiles in het-

¹⁶⁰ D. Stevenson, “Masonry,” 425.

¹⁶¹ O. Airy, “Correspondence,” 33; Kathleen Ahonen, “Johann Rudolph Glauber: A Study of Animism in Seventeenth-Century Chemistry” (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1972), 173–74.

erodox Holland. One of Moray's French friends later described the egalitarian comradeship that developed between Charles II, Moray, and their fellow refugees, as they turned to studies in chemistry, mathematics, mechanics, and natural philosophy.¹⁶² That Bruce espoused republican ideals while remaining loyal to the king did not seem inconsistent to the Scottish Masons.¹⁶³

Finally, Moray's correspondence with Bruce revealed another theme of Freemasonry—the cult of friendship—which he described in alchemical and Masonic terms. Given his familiarity with Tycho Brahe's mystical motto, he was probably aware of the Danish scientist's belief in *amicitia*, in which "the contemplation of nature could unite friends and bring spiritual release."¹⁶⁴ Like Ficino, Tycho believed that "*amor* created a godlike, Olympian fellowship among friends who aspired to live the intellectual life of the mind." As noted earlier, Tycho expressed this creed in the architectural design and masonic dedication of the castle-laboratory at Uraniborg, his "magical talisman." Moray's concept of Masonic brotherhood was as serious, mystical, and passionate as Tycho's.

Proceeding cautiously, Moray gradually revealed the secrets of *amicitia* to Bruce, writing in February 1657 that "I did not think you had been so fully determined for the great work as I now see you are."¹⁶⁵ A week later, he chided Bruce for his timid conventionality: "If your friendship be mixed with such insipid civility, send it hither to me or rather bring it and I promise you I will limbeck it to a much purer temper." As his instruction and their mutual chemical studies continued, Moray added architectural imagery to his alchemical-magnetic explication:

... besides this Dorick Justice, that is but plain and course, there is another Corinthian, or rather, if you please, composed. Myne own friendship is of that stuff I say yours is, and so I must either ascribe it to bare inclinations . . . or take in those experimentall causes, which are a kind of physicall cause of more palpable nature than bare hidd sympathies, and beget friendships by a kinde of contraction, as fire does.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶² Samuel de Sorbière, *A Voyage to England* (London: J. Woodward, 1709), 30, 32.

¹⁶³ O. Airy, "Correspondence," 28.

¹⁶⁴ J. Christianson, *Tycho's Island*, 44, 50.

¹⁶⁵ Kincardine MS.5049.f.46.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, f.128.

While he and Bruce strove to develop long-distance intellectual communication and spiritual bonding, Moray drew on the sympathetic magic advocated by Fludd and Digby:

... we will laugh at those who doubt of the weapon salve and powder of sympathy; but hope to get the Magneticall danger of signifying our minds to one another, without as much as a Smyrna postillion, or writing as though we be as far asunder as the two Indies ... true Naturalists know that spirits have their communication at a distance ... for they have acquaintance with things that need not contiguity to converse with one another ...¹⁶⁷

By April 1658 Moray was ready to instruct Bruce in his method of regulating the passions and achieving divine communication. Tycho similarly advocated an activist form of contemplation, which transmuted the power of fraternal “desire” to achieve “ecstatic union with the Divine One.”¹⁶⁸ Moray assured his protégé that he was capable of such initiation and then hinted at the spiritual and natural magic that underlay their developing bonds:

I suppose your capacity may be larger than you yet know; soules are a kind of stuff much more extensible than gold, air, yea then light. The out most pitch of yours is that I talkt of, as the thing I am to help you to learn ... There is a kind of Metaphysicall Alchimy that I use in such cases that searches the very hirmes [corners or crevices] of the fountains without looking after the streames. I do not tell you it is physiognomy, metaposcropy, palmistry, nor what is learnt from the starres. The pulse is not a surer indice of the heart's motions, then the rules of this Science are of friendship, to know how high, how solid, how sincere, how strong, and how durable: there's enough at once.¹⁶⁹

Moray's long discussions on heraldry and the proper designing of his and Bruce's emblems were prompted by his belief that these “hieroglyphs” possessed talismanic power and expressed the owner's soul. He sketched his proposed Mason's Mark, in which the pentacle featured Greek letters between its outer angles. Stevenson observes that “this technique of finding letters concealed in the pentacle was long established,” dating from its Jewish origins and used by Agrippa in *De Occulta Philosophia*.¹⁷⁰ Having discovered the Greek word *Agapa*

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., f.188.

¹⁶⁸ J. Christianson, *Tycho's Island*, 48, 50.

¹⁶⁹ Kincardine MS.5050.f.23.

¹⁷⁰ D. Stevenson, “Masonry,” 415–16.

in the pentacle, Moray then used it for an acrostic: *Agapa*, he loves or love thou; *Gnothi*, an imperative "know"; *Anecho*, remain constant or endure; *Pisteuei*, put trust in; *Apecho*, abstain or exercise restraint. The passionate language of Moray's letters to Bruce, sealed with his Mason's Mark, was described by Moray himself as "courting" in "language fitter for a mistress." As Airy notes,

The friendship was less like that of men of the world, who had seen courts and camps and had spent the last years in civil tumult, and in personal risk, than of two sweet women, who had battled together in retirement and humility against the troubles of life, and who, each knowing the most delicate workings of the other's heart, now found rest and comfort in sending to one another the warm outpourings of a yearning love.¹⁷¹

When Moray wrote Bruce, who was on his way to The Hague, that his joy will be raised to a "transport," when "I get you in my arms," his language strikingly recalled that of King James in his passionate (and often puerile) letters to his son Charles and favorite Buckingham. When the elderly James vowed to the embattled Buckingham that they would make "a new marriage" and called him "my sweet child and wife" and himself "your dear dad and husband," he drew on the homophilic language of Hermetic, Cabalistic, and Masonic fraternal bonding.¹⁷² As with James I's, there seems no reason to consider Moray's form of male relationship as carnally homosexual.

Moray's letters provide a unique insight into the intellectual and spiritual world of an active Freemason in the 1650's. They also make clear that many "modern" trends of speculative Masonry were already emerging among the royalist exiles on the Continent. Moreover, Moray may have shared his Masonic interests with his "comrade" and fellow-lodger, the French physician Massonet, and the French military officers, with whom he regularly dined and socialized.¹⁷³ Peter Massonet was created an M.D. by Charles I in 1646, served as writing instructor to the princes Charles and James, and then fought for Charles II in England.¹⁷⁴ While in exile, he became the confidential friend of Balcarres and Moray.¹⁷⁵ French historians refer

¹⁷¹ O. Airy, "Correspondence," 26.

¹⁷² R. Lockyer, *Buckingham*, 233.

¹⁷³ Kincardine MS.5049. ff.24, 119.

¹⁷⁴ Clarendon, *History*, V, 324–29.

¹⁷⁵ E. Nicholas, *Nicholas Papers*, III, 168.

to a murky tradition of Stuart-French Masonic interchange during the Interregnum, and Massonet may have been privy to Moray's Masonic strategies as well as his Hermetic experiments. Though Moray claimed to live as a hermit in Maastricht, he continued to serve as a political intelligencer and contact person for the international royalist network. Thus, by examining that network in the context of possible Masonic associations, we can evaluate the plausibility of eighteenth-century claims about Masonic contributions to the Stuart restoration.

Unfortunately, there is a dearth of information on Freemasonry in England during the Interregnum, despite speculation about the possible Masonic activities of Ashmole and Thomas Vaughan. Fragments of evidence do suggest, however, that Moray and Lauderdale could have called upon a few royalist Masons in London. Though Ashmole did not record any further Masonic participation until 1682, he became friendly with John Evelyn who was currently investigating operative masonry. Both men travelled through England to inspect the condition of religious and royal architecture.¹⁷⁶ They also helped William Dugdale's research for his royalist architectural treatise, *The History of St. Paul's Cathedral* (1658). Evelyn began a manuscript account of "*Trades: Secrets and Receipts Mechanical as they come casually to hand*," for which he tried to investigate the craft of masonry.¹⁷⁷

Planning to fill over six hundred pages, Evelyn listed alphabetically the technical subjects he would cover. Among the few he actually recorded was section M on the duties and techniques of "the Free-Mason," which revealed his contact with operative masons who shared a few of their secrets. Evelyn noted the intellectual and manual challenges required in their work, and he included the architect-engineer under L for "Liberal Arts," thus giving him gentleman status. However, these were not propitious years for the masons, for their trade suffered from Cromwellian iconoclasm. Evelyn's friend Christopher Wren later recalled that "there were no masons in London when he was a young man" (i.e., during the Interregnum).¹⁷⁸ Though it is unclear whether Wren meant operative masons or speculative Freemasons, Evelyn found the former disappointingly unco-

¹⁷⁶ C. Josten, *Ashmole*, II, 718ff.; J. Evelyn, *Diary*, III, 128, 159, 171-72.

¹⁷⁷ British Library: Evelyn MS.65.

¹⁷⁸ Wren's comment in August 1716; see Thomas Hearne, *Reliquiae Hearnianae*, 2nd ed., ed. Philip Bliss (London, 1869), II, 39.

operative. He ultimately confessed that the necessity "of conversing with mechanical capricious persons" proved too unpleasant to him.

On 9 May 1657 Evelyn wrote Robert Boyle, the Irish-Protestant chemist, about his difficulties with the project:

I have since been put off from that design, not knowing whether I should do well to gratify so barbarous an age (as I fear is approaching) with curiosities of that nature, delivered with as much integrity as I intended them; and lest by it debase much of their esteem by prostituting them to the vulgar. Rather, I conceived that a true and ingenious discovery of these and the like arts, would, to better purpose, be compiled by the use of that Mathematic-Chymico-Mechanical school designed by our friend Dr. Wilkinson [Wilkins], where they might (not without an oath of secrecy) be taught to those that either affected or desired any of them: and from thence, as from another Solomon's house, so much of them only made public, as should from time to time be judged convenient by the superintendent of that School, for the reputation of learning and benefit of the nation.¹⁷⁹

Ashmole and Evelyn were both suspected by Parliament of maintaining contact with royalists abroad, and they may have facilitated communications with Moray's Scottish Masonic network. When Sir Robert Bruce left the company of Moray and Alexander Bruce in Holland and returned to England, he called on Ashmole and Evelyn.¹⁸⁰ Evelyn also received a visit from the Marquis of Argyll, Lord Lothian, and "some other Scotch noblemen, all strangers to me."¹⁸¹ At this time, Moray believed that Argyll would support the royalist cause, which may explain Evelyn's growing intimacy with him. Though Lothian had developed friendly relations with some of Cromwell's officers in Scotland, his motivation was the alleviation of his exiled father's poverty. Despite some royalists' suspicions, Moray maintained his trust in Lothian's essential loyalty.

Evelyn also communicated with Sir John Denham, who had returned to London in late 1653, where his presence was noted by Hartlib, who described him as "a Mighty ingenious man for all manner of waterworks and other ingenuities" and "a great mechanically traveller."¹⁸² It was perhaps these interests and skills that led to his

¹⁷⁹ John Evelyn, *The Diary and Correspondence of John Evelyn*, ed. William Bray (London: Henry Colburn, 1850), III, 92.

¹⁸⁰ Kincardine MS.5049.f.125.

¹⁸¹ C. Josten, *Ashmole*, II, 736; J. Evelyn, *Diary*, III, 165, 175; A. Robertson, *Moray*, 124.

¹⁸² Hartlib Papers: 28/2/81A. Ephemerides: part IV.

alleged association with Masonry and to his later friendship with Moray. In 1655 Denham was arrested as a royalist plotter, but two years later he was privy to the plans of Buckingham to return to England, "upon some design, for a rising in the city or against the Protector's person."¹⁸³ The royalists hoped to win Sir Thomas Fairfax to their cause, and Buckingham succeeded in marrying his daughter. As noted earlier, Buckingham was also named as a Mason, probably initiated during his service in Scotland. Throughout the Interregnum, Evelyn carried on a ciphered correspondence with the exiles, while Ashmole was kept under surveillance. In August 1659 Ashmole recorded that "My Study was broken open by the Soldiers, upon pretence of searching for the King, but I lost nothing out of it."¹⁸⁴

Moray's other Masonic contact in England was Lauderdale, his "friend at Windsor," who sent word to him about the work of Dr. Brian Walton on the English Polyglot Bible (1654–57), which stimulated a revival of interest in Villalpando's interpretations of the Temple.¹⁸⁵ Walton's Polyglot featured an elaborate architectural engraving on the frontispiece, designed by John Webb, as well as complex depictions of Jewish architecture by Wenscelas Hollar. That Moray wanted to see this London publication on the restored Temple of Jerusalem points to the cross-channel links established in the late 1650's which laid the Masonic groundwork for the king's restoration. That these links also included a Swedish dimension would become important to the international spread of Stuart-style Freemasonry in the eighteenth-century.

Since Alexander Bruce's arrival in Bremen, Moray had solicited news about the Swedes and Danes, whom the royalists assiduously courted. On 29 April 1658 Moray informed Bruce that he was anxiously awaiting the arrival of Bellenden, whose effort to gain Swedish support now depended on the many Scottish residents in Gothenburg.¹⁸⁶ He also recalled his earlier friendship with a Swedish military officer, whose name he uncertainly spelled as Col. Owagh Clough or Clook, and who was an expert on fortifications. "Clook" was a fellow pris-

¹⁸³ J. Denham, *Poetical Works*, 16.

¹⁸⁴ C. Josten, *Ashmole*, II, 761.

¹⁸⁵ Kincardine MS.5050.f.28 (18 April 1658). Ashmole spent much time at Windsor, while he worked on his history of the Order of the Garter, and Lauderdale spent many years in prison there. The two men became friends.

¹⁸⁶ Kincardine MS.5050.f.44; see Göran Behre, "Gothenburg in Stuart War Strategy, 1649–1760," in G. Simpson, *Scotland and Scandinavia*, 90–99.

oner at Ingolstadt, at the time of Moray's correspondence with Kircher, and the two spent much time in discussions of their mutual interests. Moray would later maintain contact with Swedish scientists. Thus, it is possible that he was privy to the clandestine establishment of a Masonic lodge, named "St. Magnus," in Gothenburg, which was chartered from Edinburgh.¹⁸⁷ From 1656 on, there were rumors that General Monk, who was currently employing the Swedish Freemason Tessin on fortification work at Leith, was leaning towards the royalist cause.¹⁸⁸ Christina, who had earlier recruited members of the Tessin family to Swedish service, now used her influence with Swedes, Spaniards, Germans, and Jews to build support for Charles II.

While this multi-national, Masonic network carried out its clandestine collaboration, an additional secret network was utilized for the restoration effort. Since January 1654 the younger sons of old royalist families in England had organized a resistance movement known as "The Sealed Knot." Collaborating with its agents were the Scottish royalists Lauderdale, from his prison cell, and Elizabeth Murray, daughter of the exiled William Murray, Earl of Dysart. Elizabeth exploited her friendship with Cromwell's wife to prevent the execution of Lauderdale and to arrange his transfer to a less onerous prison in Windsor Castle.¹⁸⁹ Now granted considerable freedom, Lauderdale added to his great library and continued his investigations of alchemical, architectural, and mathematical lore. Like Moray, Lauderdale studied Drusius, Scaliger, Amama, Kircher, and Alsted, and he acquired Rosicrucian and Fluddian works.¹⁹⁰ Considered a "master of Hebrew," he gathered rare works on Jewish traditions, and he apparently developed his "extraordinary memory" through study of his Lullist treatises.¹⁹¹ In line with Charles II's policy of bringing together royalists of different religious faiths, Lauderdale established communications with the Puritan Richard Baxter and other advocates of religious pacification.

The king's ecumenical agenda was not shared by his English

¹⁸⁷ The lodge is mentioned in Johan Starck, *Apologie des Francs-Maçons* (Philadelphie, 1779), 68; also, Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, *Lessing's Masonic Dialogues* [1778], trans. A. Cohen (London, 1927), 99-100. Both Starck and Lessing attended Swedish Rite lodges in Germany.

¹⁸⁸ E. Nicholas, *Nicholas Papers*, III, 259.

¹⁸⁹ D. Crips, *Elizabeth*, 39-50.

¹⁹⁰ Lauderdale, *Bibliotheca* (1687).

¹⁹¹ G. Burnet, *History*, I, 184.

advisor Edward Hyde, who was distrusted by Scottish Presbyterians and British Catholics. Contemptuous of Balcarres and Dysart and suspicious of Moray, Hyde instigated “false accusations” and “unjust persecution” of their Scottish party.¹⁹² In 1655 the Scots and Catholics protested to Charles II that Hyde subverted their restorationist efforts. Dr. Alexander Fraser, the king’s Scottish physician, joined with Balcarres and “other Scots at court” to draw up a petition to the king that the Scottish Presbyterians could provide valuable advice and services but “were discouraged and hindered” by Hyde, who was “an old known and declared enemy to their party; in whom they could repose no trust.”¹⁹³ They urged that Hyde be removed from the council or “at least not be suffered to be privy to anything that should be proposed by them.” Fraser had accompanied Charles II to Scotland, where he carried out important intelligence and military operations, and he enjoyed the full confidence of the king and the Scottish “Masonic” party. His distrust of Hyde was shared by Dr. Massonet, who accused Hyde of disloyalty and collusion with Cromwell. From now on, the separation of Scottish from English plotting would be reflected in the activities of Scottish Masons and English “Knotters.”

Despite the Anglo-Scottish rivalries, the energetic Elizabeth Murray tried to provide a link between the two factions. When William Murray died in December 1655, Elizabeth assumed his title and became the Countess of Dysart. Gilbert Burnet, a later protégé of Moray, noted that the beautiful Lady Dysart had “a wonderful quickness of apprehension” and had studied divinity, history, philosophy, and mathematics.¹⁹⁴ Using the cover of arranging her family’s business affairs in Belgium, she often travelled to the Continent with messages from Lauderdale to Moray, her late father’s cousin and confidante. Earlier, Dysart had hoped his daughter would marry Moray, but now the two maintained a “true friendship.” Learned in the occult sciences and gifted with second sight, she collaborated with Moray on the production of invisible inks and other chemical services to the king’s cause. Jane Clark argues that the Dysarts were undoubtedly Masons and that Elizabeth utilized Masonic symbols

¹⁹² F. Routledge, *Calendar . . . Clarendon*, III, 35, 259, 279.

¹⁹³ Clarendon, Henry Hyde, Earl of, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England*, ed. W.D. Macray (Oxford: Clarendon, 1888), V, 170–71, 316, 324–29.

¹⁹⁴ G. Burnet, *History*, I, 437–39.

and techniques of communication to transmit her messages to royalists abroad.¹⁹⁵ With considerable courage and defiant insouciance, she also carried out dangerous missions for the Sealed Knot, while she cultivated friendships with Cromwell's wife and intimates.

In March 1657 Cromwell received reports that Balcarres, from his base in Holland, was holding "a secret intelligence" with Monk; even worse, Balcarres was spreading rumors that "generall Monk is revolted" in order to build support for the royalists' "intended insurrection."¹⁹⁶ Though Monk defended himself to Cromwell and continued to enforce the military occupation in Scotland, his letters suggest some ambivalence in his position. In September he reported from Dalkeith that the Scottish ministers "begin to pray again for Charles Stuart, so there may be a new project." He then added off-handedly that he had arrested "some straggling fellows come over lately, the most of them from the King of Sweden's army." In May Cromwell's spies reported that Colonel Alexander Hamilton, kinsman of Moray's late comrade, "brought 64 Scottish soldiers from the Swedish army to Ostend."¹⁹⁷ Were these recruits members of the lodge at Gothenburg and ready to join their brethren in Holland and Scotland?

A rare surviving masonic document, composed at Perth in December 1658, suggests that there was a renewal of royalist commitment among local masons. John Mylne, who had cooperated with Monk in the building of fortifications and served with the Scottish commissioners to Cromwell, subsequently resigned all share in the conduct of public affairs. However, he retained the mastership of the "Ancient Lodge of Scone and Perth" until shortly before his death in late 1657. Though it is unknown whether Mylne was the inspiration for the proud assertions made in the 1658 document, it is clear that the Perth masons were determined to reclaim their ancient independence and royal patronage. Thus, on 24 December they issued a new "Contract by the Master Masons and fellow-craftsmen . . . on the decease of John Mylne, Master Mason and Master of the said Lodge":

That as formerly we and predecessors have and had from the temple of temples building on this earth one uniform community and union

¹⁹⁵ J. Clark, "Lord Burlington," 289–93, 304.

¹⁹⁶ J. Thurloe, *Collection*, IV, 50, 156, 183.

¹⁹⁷ F. Routledge, *Calendar . . . Clarendon*, III, 283. General Alexander Hamilton, the Newcastle initiate, died in December 1649.

throughout the whole world from which temple proceeded one in Kilwinning in this our nation of Scotland and from that of Kilwinning many more within this kingdom of which there proceeded the Abbey and Lodge of Scone, built by men of art and architecture where they placed that lodge as the second lodge within this nation, which is now past memory of many generations, and was upheld by the Kings of Scotland . . . the said Masters, Freemen, and Fellow Crafts, inhabitants within the said Burgh of Perth, were always able within themselves to maintain their first liberties, and are yet willing to do the same as the Masters, Freemen, or Fellow Crafts did formerly (whose names we know not)—But to our record and knowledge of our predecessors there came one from the North country named John Mylne, a mason, a man well experted in his calling, who entered himself both Freeman and Burgess of this Burgh, who in process of time by reason of his skill and art was preferred to be the King's Majesty's Master Mason and Master of the said Lodge at Scone, and his son John Mylne being after his father's decease preferred to the said office, and Master of of the said Lodge, in the reign of His Majesty *James the Sixth of blessed memory, who by the said second John Mylne was by the King's own desire entered Freeman, Mason, and Fellow Craft, and during all his lifetime he maintained the same as one member of the Lodge of Scone*—so that this Lodge is the most famous Lodge (if well ordered) within this kingdom—of which name of Mylne there hath continued several generations of Master Masons to his Majesties the Kings of Scotland . . . [my italics].¹⁹⁸

The rest of the document dealt with the choosing of a new master and warden for the lodge and instructions about the traditional duties (including the gift of gloves) incumbent upon the members. That John Mylne *filis* was not elected to fill his father's role was probably due to his residence in Edinburgh, where he was employed on various architectural projects (such as erecting a great vertical sundial). Importantly, the younger Mylne also represented the city at the Convention of Royal Burghs in 1655–59, when he gained the acquaintance of General Monk.

All the royalist plans were thrown into full gear when news arrived on the Continent of the death of Oliver Cromwell in September 1658. When the inept Richard Cromwell assumed the Protectorship, the royalists increased their overtures to Monk in Scotland. On 30 September a Cromwellian officer in Leith wrote to Thurloe that Scottish preachers were now using mystical language, while they pray for the deliverance of the exiles and captives to be delivered from

¹⁹⁸ R. Mylne, *Master Masons*, 128–29. Spelling modernized.

the yoke of Pharaoh and out of Egypt: "Thus they speake, but so ambiguously that they can evade, if questioned; yet see plainly that the whole people knowes their meaning."¹⁹⁹ The use of mystical Hebraic terminology harked back to the days of the first Covenant—and its underlying Masonic organization. Moreover, many Scottish masons were currently employed on the fortifications at Leith, which were directed by the Swedish architect Tessin and his commander Monk. Tessin had earlier been initiated in the Edinburgh Lodge, which was directed by John Mylne.

Monk had no respect for Richard Cromwell, and he sensed that the political situation would become increasingly volatile. Thus, he began the systematic reversal of the late Protector's policies in Scotland. While he replaced Englishmen with Scots on the courts of Justice and Exchequer, he consolidated his own power and made his rule more acceptable to the subjects of the northern kingdom.²⁰⁰ Unlike Oliver Cromwell, who despised the Scots, Monk enjoyed the company of local nobles, soldiers, and craftsmen. During his travels to all parts of the kingdom, he had developed an intelligence network that kept him abreast of the growing royalist sentiments of all segments of the population. More significantly, he allegedly became a Freemason and thus privy to the communication networks, oaths of secrecy, and bonds of loyalty between the brethren. According to a report made in 1741 by the exiled Jacobite Mason Andrew Michael Ramsay, certain royalist Masons knew of Monk's affiliation and sought to attract him to their cause.²⁰¹ That Ramsay revealed this political secret to Count Carl Gustaf Tessin, a Swedish kinsman of Monk's architect, gives it a certain piquancy.

Though Ramsay's account has been ignored by English historians of the Restoration, there is enough evidence for Monk's Masonic contacts to give it credibility. Shortly after Cromwell's death, a young Scottish architect—William Bruce of Kinross—approached Monk to solicit his support for a Stuart restoration. Fenwick suggests that

¹⁹⁹ J. Thurloe, *Collection*, VII, 416.

²⁰⁰ Ted Jamieson, *George Monck and the Restoration* (Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1975), 11–12.

²⁰¹ A.F. von Büsching, *Beiträge* VI, 329. Büsching noted that when Ramsay lectured in the lodges, he did not mention Monk's Masonic strategy for the Restoration because he did not want to arouse suspicions that the Masons were active in affairs of state. See also André Kervella, *La Maçonnerie Écossaise dans la France de l'Ancien Régime* (Paris, 1999), 208.

Bruce participated in the construction of Monk's citadels at Aire and Leith, which provided him contact with Tessin and Mylne, who directed the masons at those projects.²⁰² Bruce would later become Charles II's Surveyor of Works in Edinburgh and, according to Anderson, the Grand Master of Scottish Freemasonry.²⁰³ During the Interregnum, he reportedly pursued his architectural studies in France and Holland. A friend of Moray and cousin of Alexander Bruce, he provided a link between their Masonic networks in Europe and Scotland.²⁰⁴

Another cousin of William Bruce, the Countess of Dysart, provided communication between the exiled Masons and the Sealed Knot, and William visited her in London. From his later friendship with Lauderdale, it seems that William also contacted the latter during his imprisonment at Windsor. Through her contacts with Cromwell's inner circle, Lady Dysart may have learned that parliamentary spies had penetrated the "Sealed Knot" and had suborned its chief, Sir Richard Willis, who continued to correspond with Hyde and Nicholas while receiving Cromwellian bribes. According to Burnet, who probably received the information from Moray or the Bruces, "Thus Cromwell had all the king's party in a net. He let them dance in it at his pleasure; and upon occasion clapt them up for a short while."²⁰⁵

After Cromwell's death, his successors were worried by rumors of new link-ups between royalists in Scotland, England, and Holland. Having penetrated the "Knot," they may have suspected a Masonic element in the plotting. A rare surviving Masonic manuscript, dated 1659, suggests that parliamentary intelligencers were investigating Masonry in Britain. The manuscript "Narrative of the Free Masons Word and Signs" was a "copia vera" drafted by Thomas Martin, whose identity is otherwise unknown.²⁰⁶ It provided an account, hostile in tone and apparently made by a spy, of contemporary lodge

²⁰² Hubert Fenwick, *Architect Royal: The Life and Works of Sir William Bruce, 1630–1710* (Kineton: Roundwood, 1970), xiii, xvi, 4–9.

²⁰³ J. Anderson, *Constitutions (1738)*, 104.

²⁰⁴ Moray later collaborated with Sir William Bruce on architectural projects; see Henry M. Paton, "Letters from John, Second Earl of Lauderdale, to John, Second Earl of Tweeddale, and Others," in *Miscellany of the Scottish Historical Society*, VI (1939), 233.

²⁰⁵ G. Burnet, *History*, I, 117–18.

²⁰⁶ Manuscript presently in Royal Society, London: MS. Register Book (C), IX, ff.240–52. It was copied into the Register Book circa 1708.

practices. In passages that would have interested suspicious government agents, Martin described in detail the recognition signs used by Masons—i.e., the signs, postures, movement of hat, square paper, crooked pin, etc., used to identify the "free" worker to other operative masons, who were bound by similar oaths. He pointed out that these techniques allowed them to secretly exchange money. Other more amusing signs were blowing the nose in a handkerchief, which is then held straight out and shaken; knocking at any door with two little knocks and then a big one; saying "Star the Guile" when the glass goes around too slowly, etc.

Martin expressed his scorn for the Masons' claim to international brotherhood:

To Discourse a Mason in France, Spain, or Turkey (say they) the sign is to kneel down on his left knee and hold up his right hand to the Sun and the Outlandish Brother will presently take him up, but believe me if they go on their knees on that account they may remain there or any persons observe their Signs as long as the Jews will remain on their Beliefs, to receive their wish'd for Messiah from the East.

With Charles II currently trying to forge a unified front out of French, Spanish, and Jewish (Jews from Turkish territories?) supporters, Martin's criticism was perhaps relevant to rumors of international Masonic cooperation.

Martin then announced, "Here followeth their private Discourse by Way of Question and Answer," in which the esoteric and essentially Jewish traditions were obliquely expressed. To the catechistical questioner, the initiate answers that a "just and perfect Lodge is . . . two prentices, two fellow-crafts, and one Master on the highest hill or lowest Valley in the World without the crow of a Cock or the bark of a Dog." To the question, "from whence do you derive your principles," the initiate answers "From a greater than you." "Who is he on Earth that is greater than a free Mason" provokes the response, "He that carried to the highest pinnacle of the Temple of Jerusalem." Martin noted that "In some places they Discourse as followeth": "Where did they first call their Lodge? As the Holy Chappel of St. John." This allusion to the Knights of St. John of the Hospital suggests a chivalric theme in certain lodges—a point later reinforced by Swift's reference to "Lodges" of the "Knights of St. John of Jerusalem."²⁰⁷

²⁰⁷ J. Swift, *Prose*, V, 329.

In an apparent reference to the Mason Word, Martin tried to make sense out of a mysterious ritual:

Another they have called the Masters Word and is Mayhabyn, which is always divided into 2 words, and standing close with their breasts to each others right ankle joints, the masters grip by their right hands, and the top of their left hand fingers thrust close on the small of each others backbone, and in that posture they stand till they whisper each others ears the one Maha-, the other replies Byn.

This ritualized unification of the Masters Word drew on Cabalistic lore, in which the unification of the letters of the Tetragrammaton was “predicated on and facilitated by some form of visualization of these letters within the imagination.”²⁰⁸ Though the seventeenth-century Masons externalized the internal process into ritual gestures and postures, they still re-enacted the Cabalistic belief that “Whoever has knowledge it as if the Temple were built in his life,” because “such a person knows how to unify the unique name and it is as if he built the palace above and below.”

Martin went on to trace the traditional history of the craft, with its heavy emphasis on Hermes “the father of wisdom” and the role of Abraham in teaching geometry to Euclid. Though most of the account repeats the lore of the Cooke MS., there may be a Scottish variation in the emphasis on the Jews and Egyptians, and their subsequent dispersion to foreign lands due to overpopulation (a nod to Gathelus and Scota?):

[In Egypt] that worthy Master [Euclid] gave it the Name of Geometry, and it is call'd Masonry in this Land, since long after the Children of Israel were come into the Land of Bookest it is now amongs us the Geometry of Jerusalem. King David began the Temple of Jerusalem. That is with them Templum Dei, and then Solomon his son sent for Masons of diverse lands; 4,000 workers of stone named Masons and 3,000 were “Ordaind Masters and Governors of the Work.” King Hiram's son Dyna was his Master of Geometry and Chief Master of all his Masons and graving works . . . Thus was the worthy Craft of Masonry confirmed in the country of Jerusalem, and in many other Countrys glorious Craftsmen walking abroad into Divers Countrys . . .

While the rest of the manuscript concerns the ethical and moral guidance given to the brothers, a concluding passage would possess

²⁰⁸ E. Wolfson, *Speculum*, 291–92.

political relevance, given the current plots for restoration of the king and Episcopal church:

... you shall be true Man to God, and the holy Church, and ... you use no heresy by your Understanding or by teaching discreet men. You shall be true Liege Men to the King without Treason or falsehood, and that you know no Treason, but that you amend it, if you may or warn the King and his Council thereof.

The Stuart cause received a financial boost when Alexander Bruce married a wealthy Dutch woman at The Hague on 16 June 1659.²⁰⁹ Her father was colonel of a regiment of calvary and thus provided sympathetic military links for the exiles. Unfortunately, on 30 August the royalist Masons lost one of their most admired leaders when the Second Earl of Balcarres died. Charged by Charles II to unify the factions in Scotland and to rally French Protestants to the cause, Balcarres had exhausted himself in the king's service. According to Richard Baxter, the Puritan confidante of Lauderdale, the hostility of Edward Hyde led to Balcarres's expulsion from the Stuart court and to his subsequent depression and death.²¹⁰ That Hyde was also hostile to Moray added to the sting of the unexpected loss.

However, when Hyde intrigued against Balcarres and Moray, Henrietta Maria and Elizabeth, the "Winter Queen," supported the two Scots.²¹¹ Elizabeth also relied on Bruce for information about current restoration plans, for she felt ignored by Hyde's faction.²¹² It may be relevant that Henrietta Maria and her daughter Mary of Orange maintained friendly relations with the Dutch Jews, at the same time that the Balcarres-Moray-Bruce network worked with Sir William Davidson, who was in charge of the royalist-Jewish project. Though Hyde was aware of the king's letter to Davidson in September 1656, neither Hyde nor Nicholas ever mentioned the Jews again.²¹³ In fact, it seems likely that they were kept in the dark, while the Scots managed the clandestine arrangements.

²⁰⁹ "Kincardine Papers," *The Spottiswoode Miscellany*, II (Edinburgh: Spottiswoode Society, 1845), 211.

²¹⁰ Richard Baxter, *The Autobiography of Richard Baxter*, ed. J.M.L. Thomas (London: J.M. Dent, 1931), 100-01.

²¹¹ R. Hutton, *Charles II*, 119, 121. The Winter Queen would later try to recruit Moray, whom she greatly admired, to her court.

²¹² "Kincardine," *Spottiswoode*, II, 216.

²¹³ F. Routledge, *Calendar ... Clarendon*, III, 177.

Unlike Hyde and his party, Abraham Cowley had undertaken secret missions to Scotland, and he came to know and admire Balcarres and Moray. In 1656 the king sent Cowley to England, in order "that he might obtain information while affecting compliance and wish for retirement."²¹⁴ After Cowley was arrested, he was allowed to live "under bail," while he "took to medicine as a blind for his real designs." That Cowley was kept informed of Balcarres's activities suggests his continuing contact with Moray and his former Scottish colleagues. When he learned of the earl's death, Cowley was moved to pen a fine ode "Upon the Death of the Earl of Balcarres," who "once with so much industry and art/Had clos'd the gaping wounds of ev'ry part,/To perfect his distracted Nations Cure."²¹⁵ Balcarres's wife Anna Mackenzie, who had slept in open fields with him while they fled Cromwell's troops, was devastated by the loss of her husband. Cowley extended his praise of Balcarres to "his lovely Wife," who "Did all his Labors and his cares divide."

At the time of her husband's death, Countess Balcarres was working closely with Moray on the solicitation of letters from Huguenot leaders who vouched for Charles II's Protestant integrity. Resentful of Hyde's treatment of Balcarres and Moray and moved by the loss of their leader, the Scottish Masons may have decided to take certain restorationist plans into their own hands. If so, their actions would explain the mysterious relationship between William Bruce and General Monk. In a rare account of Bruce's secret missions between Monk and Charles II, published in Edinburgh in 1798, the author asserts that "no gentleman in a private capacity contributed more to bring about the restoration" of Charles II than this young Scot:

Being of a fine address, he found means to get acquainted with general Monk, to whom . . . he painted the distress and distractions of our country and the glory that would be acquired in restoring the royal family, in such lively colours, that the general at last opened his mind to him, and signified his inclination to serve the king; but that their measures must be carried on with utmost caution and secrecy. These joyful tidings Sir William had the honour to communicate to the king.²¹⁶

Using his architectural studies as a cover, Bruce made several trips abroad to facilitate the clandestine negotiations between Charles II,

²¹⁴ "Abraham Cowley," *DNB*.

²¹⁵ Abraham Cowley, *Poems*, ed. A.R. Waller (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1905), 413–15.

²¹⁶ Sir Robert Douglas, *The Baronage of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1798), 245.

Monk, and selected supporters in Scotland. On 7 September 1659 Monk issued a passport to Bruce to travel within Scotland and to *return* to Holland from Scotland, "Hee doing nothing prejudiciall to the Commonwealth of England. Given under my hand and seale at Dalkeith."²¹⁷ Fenwick is puzzled by "the way in which most history books and general literature bypass the incident." However, if Bruce was a Masonic messenger, then the extraordinary silence about his mission makes sense. According to Andrew Michael Ramsay, the secret plan to restore Charles II "had first been spoken and decided in a conference of Freemasons because Monk had been a member and was able to bring it to fruition without incurring the least suspicion."²¹⁸

Another eighteenth-century Mason, Nicholas de Bonneville, claimed that Monk was a Rosicrucian Mason, who utilized an elite group of *Rose-Croix* initiates to bring about the Restoration.²¹⁹ Bonneville argued that Ashmole arranged meetings of Rosicrucian royalists at Masons' Hall in Basing-Hall Street during the Interregnum. The Rosicrucians were then infiltrated by the Jesuits, who developed new signs and symbols to ensure reciprocal confidence while they worked for the Stuarts during their travels in Holland and England. Bonneville drew on symbolic rituals utilized in contemporary *Écossais* lodges to explain that "the murdered master" represented Charles I; the search for "the lost word" signified "the royal word" given by Charles II that he would reclaim the throne; the "son of the widow" pointed to Charles II as son of Henrietta Maria. To increase security, these royalist symbols were changed to the "signs of the Rose-Cross Masons."

Bonneville argued further that "the secret society of friends of the king" invested all their hopes in Monk's army in Scotland. Because they suspected some officers of infidelity, they used Rosicrucian codes to indentify and link up "honest" Masons, who then bonded secretly with Monk. After Monk's triumph over the enemies of Charles II, the symbols of the Rosicrucian Masons which expressed their liaison with the Scottish army were abandoned (only to be revived during the Jacobite struggles in the next century). Despite Bonneville's paranoia about the Jesuits, whom he viewed in 1788 as threats to *Aufklärung*, he did have access to oral and archival traditions in *Écossais* lodges, and he studied Ramsay's account of Monk's actions, as published by Büsching.

²¹⁷ H. Colvin, *Biog. Dict.*, 151–53; H. Fenwick, *Royal Architect*, 5.

²¹⁸ A. von Büsching, *Beiträge*, VI, 329.

²¹⁹ N. de Bonneville, *Maçonnerie écossaise*, part II, 2–3, 18–20.

Initiates of the eighteenth-century Clermont Rite preserved a tradition that David Ramsay was succeeded as head of the secret Templar order in 1659 by Charles II, with “Eduard Frazer” serving as his “Vikar.”²²⁰ Baron von Starck, the German source for these early Scottish-Templar Masons, was often inaccurate or confused about their forenames and spellings, and “Eduard” was probably Dr. Alexander Fraser, who had earlier distanced Scottish Presbyterian plotting from Hyde’s English agenda. Since 1655 Fraser had worked as a confidential agent for Lauderdale and Moray. Starck claimed that Fraser’s successors included William Bruce (1679–86) and Andrew Michael Ramsay (1708–14). Whether these Rosicrucian-Templar-Restoration traditions were developed in the 1650’s or after the 1688 fall of the Stuart dynasty remains an historical puzzle. But some pieces of that puzzle can be verified by historical documents.

On 12 October 1659, evidently at Monk’s urging, his military architect Tessin was “made Burgess and Gildbrother gratis” in Edinburgh, which conferred the highest status on him for exceptional service.²²¹ That Tessin was a Freemason seems relevant to Monk’s new strategy. On 15 November Monk summoned the noblemen, gentry, and magistrates to attend a “convention” in Edinburgh to “discuss some affaires that concerne the countries att that time.”²²² Among those attending was John Mylne *filis*, leader of the Scottish operative masons.²²³ When Monk revealed his plans to march to London in order to free his country “from the Tyranny and Usurpation of the Army,” the Scottish estates enthusiastically supported him.

Despite Monk’s public statement that his only goal was to restore the Rump Parliament as the legally constituted authority, the Earl of Glencairn and his colleagues believed that the general’s ultimate aim was the restoration of Charles II. Glencairn offered to raise twenty thousand men to march with Monk, but the shrewd general knew that such a move would provoke armed reaction in England. He asked instead that the Scots make a tax assessment to pay the garrisons that would remain and to preserve law and order after Monk departed. Significantly, Glencairn and his oath-bound com-

²²⁰ W. Zimmerman, *Von den alten*, 375.

²²¹ H. Carr, *Minutes*, 141.

²²² T. Jamieson, *Monck*, 57–58.

²²³ R. Mylne, *Master Masons*, 146. The date here given, December, is wrong, for Monck marched out of Edinburgh on 18 November.

rades later sent William Bruce on a secret mission to Charles II.²²⁴ On 18 November the "Army of Scotland" began its hazardous march south, while Monk—and allegedly his Masonic brethren—maintained tight secrecy over his real intentions.

Meanwhile, on 28 November in Brussels, Charles II received a report that Monk would "suffer Scotland to arme."²²⁵ However, virtually none of the king's English advisors were privy to the secret arrangements for Scotland. According to Moray's French friend Samuel de Sorbière, Monk had a "premeditated design" for restoring the king, which depended upon the Scottish Covenanters and Presbyterians.²²⁶ Sorbière was also aware of Hyde's hostility to Moray and the Scots, who successfully concealed their plans from their English antagonist. For the next five months, Hyde was unaware of a report that the French court had sent Monk 300,000 crowns before he left Edinburgh; if true, Moray and Countess Balcarres had done their work well.²²⁷ On 13 December, while camped at Coldstream, Monk issued an historic order that the Scots could begin re-arming themselves and collecting militias.²²⁸ He also confided to his royalist chaplain John Price that "with the King now behind him, he now had the authority."

On 8 January 1660 Monk met Sir Thomas Fairfax and the Duke of Buckingham at York, where their troops promised the support of the northern counties. As the only English courtier who had earlier been trusted by the Scots and as "an old Mason," Buckingham may have been privy to the Masonic support system utilized by Monk. He would later collaborate with Moray, Alexander Bruce, and Lauderdale on secret political affairs.²²⁹ At this time, Buckingham employed John Heydon, a Rosicrucian enthusiast, who claimed to have predicted in 1659 that Monk would come into England and that Charles II would subsequently be restored.²³⁰ As a witness to

²²⁴ F. Routledge, *Calendar . . . Clarendon*, IV, 620; V, 10.

²²⁵ T. Jamieson, *Monck*, 79.

²²⁶ S. Sorbière, *Voyage*, 59. Sorbière's claims about the dominant Scottish role in the Restoration infuriated the English chaplain, Thomas Sprat, who served the anti-Scottish Edward Hyde (later Lord Clarendon); see Thomas Sprat, *Observations on Mons. de Sorbière's Voyage into England* (London, 1708), 151–53.

²²⁷ F. Routledge, *Calendar . . . Clarendon*, IV, 668, 681–82.

²²⁸ T. Jamieson, *Monck*, 78.

²²⁹ Paton, "Letters from . . . Lauderdale," 168.

²³⁰ John Heydon, *Theomagia, or the Temple of Wisdom* (London: Henry Brome, 1664), book III, 133.

his Rosicrucian prediction, Heydon named "Mr. Flood" (evidently Dr. Lewen Fludd, nephew and executor of Robert Fludd).

On 29 January 1660 Alexander Bruce was in London, where Moray wrote to him "at the Stonecutter's house, next to Wallingford House, Charing Cross."²³¹ That Bruce was staying with an operative mason is suggestive, especially since Moray continued to write in code about their "latest design" concerning Monk. On 4 February, a hint appeared in a ciphered letter to Charles II that the king was working closely and secretly with Moray.²³² One day later, Monk and his "Coldstreamers" arrived in London, where he maintained his public mask as a supporter of Parliament. In the meantime, Moray eagerly awaited news from Lauderdale and referred to plans for the restoration and the allotment of places in the new government. In March, when Monk ordered the release of Lauderdale from prison, he enabled that Scottish agent to join his countrymen in London.

With the Earl of Crawford-Lindsay, who was also released, Lauderdale wrote to Lord St. Clair in Scotland, urging him to keep the king's supporters quiet and to continue working with "the Generall." Then, in a charge that echoed the Masonic-style organization of the first Covenanting movement, Lauderdale asserted:

Your maine work is to unite among yourselves and to keep up the spirit of the people. Wee know but two pairties in Scotland, those who stand for the right and liberties, the Laws and Government of Scotland, and those who have protested and acted against those good ends. The last we doe not looke on as Scotsmen. It is the former whom we humbly exhort to perfite union, what ever differences have been among them before; for the Lord's sake lay aside faction and animositee and prevent all Divisive motions: for this purpos it is humbly proposed that some of the greatest interest meet privately at Edinbr. to keep correspondencies with meetings of honest men in every shire. Let the centre of your union be the libertie and restitution of Scotland, and the great means of preserving it will be heartie concurrences in such friendly and necessarie meetings.²³³

That St. Clair was still considered the hereditary patron of the operative masons and that the Lindsay family was associated with

²³¹ Kincardine MS.5050. ff.68-69.

²³² F. Routledge, *Calendar . . . Clarendon*, IV, 547. Significantly, this letter did not pass through Hyde's hands.

²³³ Osmund Airy, ed., *The Lauderdale Papers*, Camden Society, n.s. 34 (London, 1884), I, 8-9.

Freemasonry and Rosicrucianism makes Lauderdale's appeal consistent with Ramsay's and Bonneville's accounts of Masonic-Rosicrucian complicity with Monk in the Restoration.²³⁴

Taking advantage of his release from prison, Lauderdale began working immediately to link his friends in Scotland with collaborators in London and abroad. On 12 March Moray wrote optimistically to Alexander Bruce about the progress of their plans:

I must tell you the joy I have of our friends' liberties, the fair prospects of a turn in our affairs . . . The freeing of [General] Booth is bold: but if all interests be secured which I think will now be their work, they take a noble course. And if London once settle their militia it is lykely to be safe enough.²³⁵

In March Lauderdale sent instructions to Countess Balcarres and Moray, who were in Paris, to solicit more letters from French Huguenots in support of Charles II's Protestant convictions.

On 6 April the Earl of Rothes wrote Lauderdale about the secret preparatory work in Scotland. Probably familiar with the earlier use of Masonic networks in 1637, Rothes hinted at the restorationist commitment made by Monk before he left Edinburgh. Stressing the need for absolute secrecy about his letter, Rothes revealed that Monk (whom he did not name) vowed that "our King should be reestablished" if he would have but a little patience and not spoil the business himself by precipitation.²³⁶ Confident that "his design is honest," Rothes was delighted that Lauderdale was now working closely with Monk. Now that "there is so good an understanding betwixt you," Rothes was sure that Monk would follow Lauderdale's advice and that "the time of our King's restoration and so consequently our redemption from slavery is very near." When Rothes utilized sympathetic ink to write "in a hidden uay," he may have included some hieroglyphic to indicate its presence. Years later, Moray would remind Lauderdale that "where you see my Mason Mark you will remember what it means"—i.e., that writing follows in invisible ink.²³⁷

On 9 April from The Hague, John Davidson (kinsman of Sir

²³⁴ In 1646 Crawford-Lindsay signed Charles I's warrant to John Mylne, which appointed him king's Master Mason for life; see R. Mylne, *Master Masons*, 141–42.

²³⁵ Kincardine MS.5050.f.70.

²³⁶ O. Airy, *Lauderdale Papers*. I, 10. Spelling modernized. Though Rothes does not name Monk, the context of the letter makes clear that the general is the subject.

²³⁷ *Ibid.*, n.s. 36, II, 15–16.

William Davidson) sent an enclosure sealed with “the arms of Bruce” to the king.²³⁸ As noted earlier, Moray had urged Alexander Bruce to include his Mason’s Mark on his familial crest. On the same day, Moray wrote to Bruce that his report from England convinced the Scots in Paris that the time was now ripe “as to the design in general and the intentions of persons of most weight in particular” (followed by heavily coded references to Monk and their network).²³⁹ On 12 April Charles II wrote from Brussels to Lauderdale:

... you will easily believe that I am very glad you are at liberty, and in the place where you can do me most service, by disposing your frindes to that temper and sobriety which must be a principle ingredient to that happynesse we all pray for . . . I know not how in this conjuncture to give our frindes you mention any direction or advise, sinse what they are to do must depend upon what is done somewhere else. I hope wee shall shortly meet . . .²⁴⁰

From later documents, it is clear that the king sometimes used an odd sigil—his Mason’s Mark?—in his letters to Lauderdale.²⁴¹ Moreover, it bore a striking resemblance to the sigil used by Moray to identify Monk in his letters to Bruce.²⁴² On 23 April Moray again expressed his gratitude to Bruce for sending some kind of proof of Monk’s loyalty—possibly his Mason’s Mark or fraternal oath? Moray revealed that “we had many strong arguments, and many assurances that [sigil for Monk] was well inclined, and for my part fixt in my thoughts a firm opinion,” but “we never had anything so authentick and binding as what you wrote.”

Moray also praised Henry Jermyn, now Earl of St. Albans, who helped him conclude a financial affair concerning the late Balcarres. Decades earlier, Jermyn had collaborated with Prince Charles, Buckingham, Kerr, and Gerbier during their residence in Spain, where he shared their interests in the architecture of the Escorial.²⁴³ The confidante of Henrietta Maria and her Franco-Scottish supporters, Jermyn sided with Fraser and Balcarres in their quarrels with Hyde, and he sympathized with their Presbyterian concerns.²⁴⁴

²³⁸ F. Routledge, *Calendar . . . Clarendon*, IV, 624.

²³⁹ Kincardine MS.5050.f.69.

²⁴⁰ W. Mackenzie, *Maitland*, 193.

²⁴¹ See example in O. Airy, *Lauderdale Papers*, n.s. 38, III, 22.

²⁴² Kincardine MS.5050. ff.68, 77 (29 January 1660, 23 April 1660).

²⁴³ R. Lockyer, *Buckingham*, 140.

²⁴⁴ F. Routledge, *Calendar . . . Clarendon*, IV, 684.

Anderson claimed that St. Albans became the first Grand Master of restored Stuart Freemasonry, possibly through the influence of Moray, who confided to Bruce in April 1659:

The truth is, he [St. Albans] is a very noble Gent. and I begin to get into his bosom. He uses me most handsomely . . . the Matter is amongst gent d'honneur and I dare say Lord St. Albans would do in such a case just as he desires to be done to.²⁴⁵

In May Lauderdale joined the king at Breda, where he reported on the secret negotiations with Scotland and on Moray's efforts with French Protestants. On 4 May Glencairne wrote the king expressing his concern that his Scottish group had "no word" from "Mr. Bruce since they sent him to the King."²⁴⁶ The bearer, Sir Alexander Gibson, had "partaken in all Monk's late proceedings" in Scotland and could inform the king about the clandestine arrangements. This note, which did not pass through Hyde's hands, apparently refers to William Bruce. Not only the Scots but Monk were determined that Hyde would be kept in the dark about their strategy. According to Burnet, "Monk had always a very particular dislike to Chancellor Hyde," and "the chief thing that staggered Monk in the whole transaction [at Breda] was having anything to do with him."²⁴⁷ On 17 May the "Winter Queen" wrote from The Hague to Alexander Bruce, her "verie affectionat Frend," to thank him for being the only one who "tooke the paines" to communicate to her the good news about the imminent restoration.²⁴⁸

On 20 May, three days before Charles II sailed for England, a joyful Moray wrote confidently to Alexander Bruce about his hopes for Britain under the restored Stuart monarchy:

What a wonderful work hath the Lord God brought about in a little time. How farre are things now from what they were but a few weekes ago! and what great cause have we to pay our vovs to that God that granted our desires. While we joy in the salvation of our God for the bringing back the captivity of our king and country, having our mouths full of his praises, let us not leave off to mix our thanksgivings with new vovs that he may finish gloriously what he hath in mercy so

²⁴⁵ J. Anderson, *Constitutions (1738)*, 101; Kincardine MS.5050.f.83.

²⁴⁶ F. Routledge, *Calendar . . . Clarendon*, V, 10.

²⁴⁷ G. Burnet, *History*, I, 160.

²⁴⁸ "Kincardine," *Spottiswoode*, II, 216.

farre carried on, and not draw back his hand till he hath settled his Jerusalem so as it may be matter of praise to the whole earth.²⁴⁹

At the same time, Moray shared Lauderdale's fear that Scotland would be ignored or treated as a dependency of England in the restoration settlement: "I am ill satisfied that they have sent down judges to Scotland, as if they meant to hold our nation where Cromwell put it." His great concern was the re-establishment of Scottish independence in matters of religious and civil governance. In the letter above to Bruce, Moray expressed his hope that the Scottish "embassage" to the king would "represent the thralldome of our nation, and to procure the remouvall of the English forces out of it, and leave the kingdom to its ancient Government in all respects."

In April Monk sent private instructions to the king concerning royalist proposals for settling the civil, military, and religious state of Great Britain. He especially advised that Charles personally guarantee liberty of conscience and religious toleration among his subjects. As Jamieson notes, Monk did not recommend that Parliament participate in a debate over religion; instead, he urged the king to grant toleration and thus avoid divisive arguments. However, Charles was persuaded by Hyde and his English advisors to include a parliamentary role for religious questions in the Declaration of Breda, which was issued on 1 May 1660. In this highly conciliatory document, which granted amnesty to the Stuarts' enemies, the statement on religion laid the groundwork for further development of religious toleration as the highest ideal of Freemasonry:

And because the passion and uncharitableness of the times have produced several opinions in religion, by which men are engaged in parties and animosities against each other—which, when they shall hereafter unite in a freedom of conversation, will be composed or better understood—we do declare a liberty to tender consciences and that no man shall be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion in matter of religion, which do not disturb the peace of the kingdom; and that we shall be ready to consent to such an act of parliament as, upon mature deliberation, shall be offered to us for the full granting that indulgence.²⁵⁰

²⁴⁹ Kincardine MS.5050.ff.84–85.

²⁵⁰ T. Jamieson, *Monck*, 150; also 127–28.

For Moray in Paris, the declaration was seen as the surest way of ensuring peace and prosperity for "Jerusalem." Despite his own Presbyterian beliefs, he argued for the legitimacy of the king's Episcopal designs for the church. Writing to Lauderdale, Moray observed that the new Episcopacy would not be as rigid and autocratic "as it was heretofore in England," for that type of absolutist power tends to corrupt churchmen:

[It] is so consonant to Originall sin that it slides easily into flesh and blood, else it had never been the stair by which Antichrist scaled not onely the top of the Church but the very heavens to put on the roof stone upon his Babel-Babylon. But I need not run out on this theam to you.²⁵¹

Now it was time for the faction-ridden masons who built the Tower of Babel to be replaced by the universalist Freemasons who would restore the Temple of Solomon.

On 25 May 1660 Charles II landed in Dover, where he was greeted rapturously by enormous crowds. Waiting to meet him was Monk, who had been in complete charge of British governance until the king stepped ashore.²⁵² Forgiving Monk's service under Cromwell, Charles rewarded him generously, made him Duke of Albermarle, and continued to seek his counsel on personal and public affairs. One of these—the question of Charles's marriage—involved the close friendship that Monk had developed with Augustin Coronel, a Portuguese Jew who had settled in England in the early 1650's "as a merchant and royalist agent . . . receiving and distributing funds for the exiled King."²⁵³ Thus, he must have been in touch with Davidson, who handled the royalist-Jewish negotiations in Holland. Coronel collaborated with two other Jewish agents in London, David da Costa and Bento de la Coste, and he may have contacted Solomon Franco, the Hebrew teacher of Ashmole.

On the fall of the Protectorate, Coronel was made consular agent for Portugal, and he provided services to Monk from the time of the general's arrival in London. In April 1660, while the king was still in Holland, Coronel proposed to Monk that Charles II should

²⁵¹ O. Airy, *Lauderdale Papers*, I, 30.

²⁵² T. Jamieson, *Monck*, 129.

²⁵³ Lucien Wolf, "The Jewry of the Restoration, 1660–1664," *TJHSE*, 5 (1902–05), 9, 17–18; N. Roth, "Social," 128–29.

marry the Portuguese Infanta, Catherine of Braganza, and “the terms were then practically agreed to.”²⁵⁴ In October a grateful king knighted Coronel, who became the first Jewish peer of Britain. Though Coronel eventually seceded from the synagogue and converted to Christianity, Charles II had recognized his services *as a Jew*. The collaboration of Monk and Charles with royalist Jews influenced Cowley’s Hebraic themes in his “Ode upon His Majesties Restoration and Return” (1660), in which he portrayed the king, his brother James, and Monk as Jewish heroes:

Me-thought I saw the three Judaeen Youths,
(Three unhurt Martyrs for the Noblest Truths)
In the Chaldaean Furnace walk . . .

.....

Come, mighty Charles, desire of Nations, come;
Come, you triumphant Exile, home.

.....

’Tis the good General [Monk], the man of Praise,
Whom God at last in gracious pitty
Did to th’ enthrall’d nation raise,
Their great Zerubbabel to be,
To loose the Bonds of long Captivity,
And to rebuild their Temple and their City.²⁵⁵

Given Cowley’s friendship with Scottish Masons, the description of the Stuart-Jewish hero as the “Desire of Nations” in eighteenth-century Jacobite Masonic allegory may be rooted in this early restorationist rhetoric.²⁵⁶

Coronel and his royalist Jewish collaborators would have appreciated Cowley’s portrayal of Monk as a contributor to the rebuilding of the Temple. Charles’s gesture of appreciation for Coronel’s service (the knighthood bestowed in October) became especially important, because various City merchants petitioned the king on 30 November to reverse the policy of his usurping predecessor and expel the Jews.²⁵⁷ The Jews replied with their own petition, and on 7 December the king passed both documents on to Parliament for

²⁵⁴ G. Burnet, *History of My Own Time*, I, 290–91.

²⁵⁵ A. Cowley, *Poems*, 429–31.

²⁵⁶ See Andrew Michael Ramsay, *The Travels of Cyrus* (1730; Albany: Pratt and Doubleday, 1814), 315.

²⁵⁷ D. Katz, *Jews in History*, 140–43.

consideration. Influenced by Charles's promise of toleration, Parliament "was content to let the matter fade away." However, a goldsmith named Thomas Violet was so determined to expel the Jews that he published *A Petition against the Jews* on 16 December. Violet had visited the Jews' synagogue, where he spoke with "Mr. Moses their High Priest and other Jewes," and he resented the openness with which they now practised their religion, "to the great dishonour of Christianity and public scandal of the true Protestant religion."²⁵⁸ On 17 December the king responded by instructing the Lords in Council "to present an order to the House of Commons recommending the House to present measures for the protection of the Jews."²⁵⁹ Over the next years, he took a personal interest in the welfare of the Hebrew community.

The case for a Jewish and Masonic support system for the restoration is reinforced by the career of Sir William Davidson after the momentous events of 1660. When Lauderdale was named secretary of state for Scotland, he also became the friend and life-long patron of Davidson, who included Lauderdale in various Jewish mercantile ventures.²⁶⁰ In 1661 Sir William Bellenden, who had participated in the Moray-Bruce network in Holland, served as Lauderdale's right-hand man in the government of Scotland. Probably associated earlier with the Scottish Masons in Gothenburg, Bellenden now joined in the Jewish ventures. Davidson took advantage of his high status with Lauderdale and Charles II to press for rapid "naturalizement" (endenization) of his Jewish partners, while the king and Scots hoped to reap riches from their gold-mining and trading schemes in the West Indies. The king granted the Jews "a very ample form of endenization" which guaranteed them the right to own land and "other Hereditments whatsoever within ye said Kingdome of England" and to dispose of them to any person "as freely peaceably and quietly as any other of his Majesties Leige Subjects borne within this said Realme of England."

On 4 January 1662 at The Hague, Davidson called on Constantijn Huygens, who was preparing to carry political messages from the Dutch government to Charles II in London.²⁶¹ Another visitor was

²⁵⁸ L. Wolf, "Jewry of Restoration," 10.

²⁵⁹ L. Wolf, "Status of Jews," 183.

²⁶⁰ H. Paton, "Letters from . . . Lauderdale," 167, 173, 181, 190. For the following events, see W. Samuel, "Davidson," 49, 58-59, 69, 71.

²⁶¹ Constantijn Huygens, *Briefwisseling*, V, 383.

the Jewish agent La Costa, who brought Huygens a gift and discussed the huge dowry, including the north African colony of Tangier, that Portugal would give to Charles II. In March Davidson and his Jewish partners arrived in London, where the king received them in audience at Whitehall and bestowed upon Isaac Israel de Piso a gold chain as a "Mark of Our Royall Favour." Though Sir Augustin Coronel had converted by this time, the royalist Jews did not perceive the Stuart government nor its agents as proselytizers. In October Moray reported to Alexander Bruce on Davidson's business and official activities undertaken for the king in Holland.²⁶² These contacts between Scottish Masons and European Jews would continue over the next years.

Thus, in 1663, when Rabbi Jacob Abendana dedicated to Davidson his Spanish translation of Halevi's *Kuzari* (subtitled "Defense of a Despised Religion"), he expressed his admiration for the Scot's loyalty to his king and respect for Jewish tradition:

This excellent book contains Jewish Theology . . . [It] proves the errors of the Gentiles, destroys the false opinions of the Philosophers, gives evidence showing the ignorance of the Karaites, proves the truth of Divine Law . . .

Your Worship has shown your glorious fidelity and constant loyalty towards the most Serene King of Great Britain, your natural Lord and Master, who, absent from his majestic throne, through various accidents, and withdrawn from his opulent Provinces, has experienced in your worship the height to which Royal felicity can reach, in finding a vassal who by continued help has considerably relieved the cares of an offended Majesty, preserving, amid the tumult of the greatest disturbances, and of the most detestable ingratitude of many, the love which makes up for that of all others, and is constant both as regards the laws of nature and of duty.²⁶³

Abendana was most interested in Halevi's explanation of the means by which God communicates with men and reveals His will to them, which the philosopher scientifically demonstrated as a particular technique of worship. Arguing that Solomon was expert in all sciences and that "the roots and principles of all sciences were handed down from us," Halevi explained "the relics of the natural science" which survived among the ancient Jews, especially in the *Sepher Yetzirah*:

²⁶² Kincardine MS.5050.ff.104, 152.

²⁶³ W. Samuel, "Davidson," 40-41.

To this belongs the "Book of Creation" by the Patriarch Abraham. Its contents are very profound, and require thorough explanation. It teaches the unity and omnipotence of God by means of various examples, which are multiform on one side and uniform on the other. They are in harmony with regard to the One, their Director. . . . *S'far* means the calculation and weighing of the created bodies, the calculation which is required for the harmonious and advantageous arrangement of a body based on a numerical figure. Expansion, measure, weight, relation of movements, and musical harmony, all these are based on the number expressed by word *S'far*. No building emerges from the hand of the architect unless its image had first existed in his soul.²⁶⁴

That Davidson's royalist-Jewish network has received little notice from historians of the Restoration is consistent with the similar omission of Monk's Scottish-Masonic network. Perhaps the stringent requirements of secrecy (as well as the determination of Lauderdale, Moray, and Bruce to manage Scottish affairs without interference by English politicians) explains the near silence about this "secret history." In his important article about Davidson, Wilfred Samuel observed in 1936,

In a way it is curious that the Jewish Historical Society should now be taking a hand in rescuing from oblivion the memory of a distinguished public man whose "example of constant loyalty" was, according to Rabbi Abendana, "deserving of eternal remembrance."²⁶⁵

Abendana's support of the Stuart cause was rooted in Jewish philosophical and mystical traditions, which made clear that the cosmic "one order" is "the work of a one-Master, who is God," and that an anointed king is the earthly embodiment of that divine architect.

Like Davidson, Moray, and the Scottish Masons who returned from exile, Rabbi Abendana and the Jewish royalists would seek a revival of the ancient sciences of Solomon, by which "the holy Temple" could be rebuilt within the adept and restored to its place in the center of the cosmos. Hinting at the mystical mathematics and architectural visualizations of the *Sepher Yetzirah*, Abendana assured Davidson and Charles II that, according to Yehudah Halevi, the center would now hold:

"Seven double, six plains for the six sides, and the holy Temple placed in the middle. Blessed be He from His place; He is the Place of the

²⁶⁴ J. Halevi, *Kuzari*, 228.

²⁶⁵ W. Samuel, "Davidson," 63.

universe, but the universe is not His place.” This is an allusion to the Divine Influence which unites the contrasts. The book compares Him to the central point of a body, with six sides and three dimensions. As long as the centre is not fixed, the sides cannot be fixed . . . The authority ruling the spiritual world is compared to a king on his throne, whose commands, or even smallest hints, are obeyed by his servants, high and low, who know him, without any movement on his part or on theirs . . . For he must show himself at the borders in order that all parts should see him as a redoutable and benevolent ruler.²⁶⁶

For Jewish and Scottish royalists, the restoration of the Stuart monarchy was thus a fulfillment of “the laws of nature and of duty.”²⁶⁷

²⁶⁶ J. Halevi, *Kuzari*, 231–33.

²⁶⁷ Abendana’s dedication to Davidson; in W. Samuel, “Davidson,” 41.

CHAPTER TEN

“THE PLEASANT THEATRE OF NATURALL THINGS”: ROSICRUCIANISM, FREEMASONRY, AND THE ROYAL SOCIETY (1660–1673)

I look upon these ROSE CRUCIANS above all men truly inspired . . . I am ravished with admiration of their miracles and transcendent mechanical inventions . . . and compare them with Bezaliel and Aholiab, those skilful and cunning workers of the Tabernacle . . . We acknowledge *Carolus Magnus Secundus* for our Christian Head.

—John Heydon, Secretary of Nature, *The Holy Guide* (1662)

His Majesty being Prince of Philosophers, and of Physico- Mathematical Learning, . . . you [Robert Moray] are not only his Majesties Privie Council for Philosophie, but also his great Council. You are the three Estates, viz. the Mathematical, Mechanical, and Physical. You are his Parliament of Nature.

—John Graunt, *Natural and Political Observations* (1662)

On 29 June 1660 Charles II was at supper with the Duke of Buckingham and John Heydon, the self-proclaimed champion of the “Rosie-Crucian Seraphical illuminated fraternity.”¹ The opportunistic Heydon was delighted when Buckingham vouched for his claim of having predicted the time of the Restoration, for “the Duke again verified this Art, and hath found it infallible, being as it were *Rosie Crucian Axiomata*.” Since Buckingham had supported Monk’s march to London, he was in the good graces of the king, and he introduced his friend Heydon to the court. This patronage was important because Heydon, using the pseudonym “Eugenius Theodidactus,” had earlier dedicated *The Prophetical Trumpeter* (1655) to Henry Cromwell. Now anxious to establish royalist credentials for potential patrons, Heydon launched a propaganda campaign for the wonders of Rosicrucian science. In the process, he shed light on a shadowy but persistent Rosicrucian influence on developments in Freemasonry and the Royal Society.

¹ John Heydon, *The Holy Guide* (London, 1662), 3; *Theomagia, or the Temple of Wisdom* (London: Henry Brome, 1664), Book III, 122.

In May 1658, when currying favor with parliamentarians, Heydon published *A New Method of Rosie-Crucian Physick*, in which he stressed the Jewish origins of Rosicrucianism. Moses was “father and founder” of the fraternity, which was of “the order of Elias or Ezekiel,” and contemporary Rosicrucians are initiated “into the Mosaicall Theory.”² Changing his political tune in August 1660, Heydon dedicated *The Rosie Crucian Infalliable Axiomata* to James Stuart, Duke of York, and asserted that it was written in the days of mourning for his friends who were imprisoned or murdered by “the Tyrant Cromwell.” He further claimed to have fought for Charles I and then (while travelling in Spain, Italy, and Turkey) to have predicted the royalists’ defeat at Worcester and Cromwell’s downfall. Assuring James that he had labored for the Restoration, Heydon then delivered a standard history of the *Fratres R.C.*, largely cribbed from Vaughan’s books (which he earlier criticized for “leading the eyes to slumber”). However, he added a new enticement by affirming that the Rosicrucians currently maintained another vault—besides the one in Germany—in the west of England.

Importantly, while Charles and his brother were involved in plans for a new society of sciences, Heydon praised James for his expertise in natural and supernatural science: “By the acuteness of your understanding . . . you are able to view, search, contemplate, discern, and pierce thorow the pleasant Theatre of Naturall Things.” To fully understand nature, the student must study the “Natural Magic of Solomon,” which consisted of Cabalistic and Lullist number mysticism (the Rosicrucian *Axiomata*). From many allusions in Heydon’s writings, it is clear that he was familiar with operative masonry, probably through his collaboration with Buckingham. Thus, his often comical versions of Rosicrucian projects and scientific experiments provide a theatrical backdrop to the serious efforts by Moray, Bruce, Evelyn, Ashmole, and other Masonic students of Rosicrucianism to establish a royal society of experimental science.

In England during the last years of the Interregnum, various groups of chemists, physicians, and mathematicians clubbed together in order to discuss the “New Philosophy.” At Kensington, Henshaw, Vaughan, and various royalist colleagues carried on their quasi-Rosicrucian

² John Heydon, *A New Method of Rosie-Crucian Physick* (London: Thomas Locke, 1658), 3–5, 10, 38, 59.

efforts; at Oxford, an "Invisible College" gathered around Robert Boyle, Robert Hooke, John Wilkins, and Christopher Wren; in London, mathematicians at Chelsea College listened to lectures by William Oughtred and Samuel Foster, while Samuel Hartlib, John Dury, and various disciples of Comenius dreamed of establishing their pansophic "Antilia." As a semi-clandestine network, members of these groups visited each other and shared news from abroad. They were determined that political and religious differences would not interfere with their fragile scientific enterprise, which received no official encouragement or support.

An important mediator between the parliamentarians and royalists was the Reverend John Wilkins, who was appointed Warden of Wadham College, Oxford by Parliament and who married Cromwell's sister. An energetic promoter of mathematics and experimental science, Wilkins earned the respect of royalists like Evelyn when he protected the university buildings and libraries from destruction by Cromwell's soldiers. His moderate attitudes impressed the Countess of Dysart, when she befriended Cromwell's sister (while secretly collaborating with Moray and Lauderdale). Wilkins earlier published two scientific works that reflected the eclectic Solomonian visions of the Stuart kings, despite his later adherence to the parliamentary cause.

In *Mercury: or the Secret and Swift Messenger. Shewing How a Man May with Privacy and Speed Communicate his Thoughts to a Friend from Any Distance* (1641), Wilkins presented a learned treatise on cryptography which drew heavily on Hermetic and Cabalistic lore and on the writings of Trithemius and Cardano. While discussing techniques of ciphering and recipes for invisible inks, Wilkins also discussed the belief held by many contemporaries that important scientific and technological information was encoded in the Jewish scriptures:

And if you will believe the Jews, the Holy Spirit hath purposely involved in the Words of Scripture, every Secret that belongs to any Art or Science, under such Cabalisms as these. And if a Man were expert in unfolding of them, it were easie for him to get as much Knowledge as Adam had in his Innocency, or Human Nature is capable of.

But tho' such Conjectures may be allowable in some particulars, yet to make all Scriptures capable of like Secrets, does give such latitude to Men's raving and corrupt fancies, as must needs occasion many wild and strange absurdities.³

³ John Wilkins, *The Mathematical and Philosophical Works* (London, 1708), 42-43.

When Wilkins dedicated *Mathematical Magick: or the Wonders that May Be Perform'd by Mechanical Geometry* (1648) to the Prince Elector Palatine and supported his restoration, he linked his scientific program to the political agenda of the early Continental Rosicrucians. Lamenting that vulgar opinion attributes all such "strange operations" (mechanical and mathematical inventions) unto the power of magic, he attempted to legitimise technological innovation by linking it to the construction of Solomon's Temple, which involved complex building techniques, and to Vitruvian standards for architecture. Drawing further on Dee's preface to Euclid, Fludd's mechanical tracts, and Kircher's works on magnetism, he provided drawings and explanations of many experiments that were formerly viewed as magical in nature. Curiously, Wilkins seemed to believe in the reality of the ever-burning lamp found in "the Sepulchre of Francis Rosicrosse, as is more largely expressed in the Confession of that Fraternity."⁴

Wilkins's notion of mathematical magic reflected a growing interpretation of Rosicrucian science as an essentially mathematical art. Fogarty stresses the connection of this kind of Rosicrucianism with early modern scientific thought:

Rosicrucian "science" comprised a system of mathematics and mechanics for the lower world, celestial mathematics for the higher world, and angelic conjuration for the supercelestial world. In principle, the angelic sphere could be penetrated by the use of Rosicrucian technique, and, thus, the essence of all reality was graspable.⁵

When Christopher Wren joined Wadham College in 1650, he came under Wilkins's influence, which merged Vitruvian, Cabalistic, and Rosicrucian notions of mathematics and science.⁶ Christopher's uncle Matthew Wren, D.D., had accompanied Charles I on his journeys to Spain and Scotland, where he shared the king's architectural interests, and his father Dr. Christopher Wren "made notes in Wotton's *Elements of Architecture*, showing his knowledge of that art."⁷ At age sixteen, Christopher *filis* translated William Oughtred's tract on *Geometrical Dialling*, and he maintained a lifelong interest in the art,

⁴ Ibid., 136.

⁵ H.W. Fogarty, "Rosicrucianism," in Mircea Eliade, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Religion* (New York: Macmillan, 1987).

⁶ See J.A. Bennett, *The Mathematical Science of Christopher Wren* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982), 16–19.

⁷ C. Wren, *Parentalia*, 49, 142, 184, 206, 209, 239.

still strongly associated with Scottish Freemasonry. Wren concluded that dialling was invented by the ancient Jews and that John Napier revived and elaborated its esoteric-mathematical techniques. By July 1654, when Evelyn visited Wren and Wilkins, he was delighted at the progression of their studies in Vitruvian design and mathematical magic.⁸

It was during this period that Evelyn attempted his study of operative masonry, which led him to advocate oaths of secrecy to protect the esteem of certain crafts. However, as he complained to Boyle in 1657, it would require a "Solomon's House" to accomplish the virtuosos' plans in such a "barbarous age." His fear that the decline of learning under the Protectorate portended a "darke night of Ignorance & barbarity" was reinforced by his secret intelligence work for the exiled king. Then, in April 1659, new thinking about "Solomon's House" was spurred by the arrival in London of the Swedish pansophist Bengt Skytte, who was sent by Carl X to persuade Parliament to resurrect Oliver Cromwell's dream of an anti-Catholic military alliance.⁹ The unstable political situation led Skytte to focus instead on his personal ambition to establish a "universal university" and "Sophopolis" in England.¹⁰ Skytte had met Dury and Comenius when they visited Sweden, and he was privy to Bureus's Rosicrucian theories and Christina's esoteric studies (though he lost her favor when he supported Carl X's alliance with Cromwell). As an heir to the Rosicrucian Enlightenment in Sweden, where Thomas Vaughan's works were avidly read, Skytte expected to find similar Hermeticists in London.¹¹

Skytte approached several virtuosos with his plan for an international residential college (which drew on Bacon, Andreae, and Comenius), and he received sympathetic responses from Hartlib, Beale, and Boyle. Hartlib perceived Skytte's plan as a fulfillment of

⁸ J. Evelyn, *Diary*, III, 110–11.

⁹ D. Dickson, *Tessera*, 218–23.

¹⁰ Anders Grape, "Comenius, Bengt Skytte och Royal Society," *Lychnos* (1936), 319–30; Margery Purver, *The Royal Society: Concept and Creation* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967), 220–33.

¹¹ For Rosicrucian interests in Sweden, see (in addition to Akerman) Sten Lindroth, *Paracelsismen i Sverige till 1600–Talets Mitt* (Uppsala, 1943), and Sven Rydberg, *Svenska Studieresor till England under Frihetstiden* (Uppsala, 1951); for the influence of Swedish Rosicrucianism on the Royal Society, see Ethel Seaton, *Literary Relations Between England and Scandinavia in the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1935), 293.

the Antilians' schemes, and he hoped it would gain priority over royalist Rosicrucian projects. On 20 July he wrote John Worthington:

I do extremely indulge the design of beginning the Buildings of Christian Societies in small Models. And in this point our Reformers may learn many parts of wisdom from our sorest adversaries . . . I hear that Mr. Ashmole hath published the orders of the Rosy Crucians & Adepti. Can you tell me what esteem it bears?¹²

In July and August, Hartlib and his foreign allies hoped that their "Antilia Or German Society/Imago Societatis" would gain enough funds to emerge as a public organization.¹³

Hartlib evidently discussed his plans with Evelyn, who like Ashmole was a royalist "adversary" worth consulting. On 9 August 1659 Evelyn wrote Boyle to praise Hartlib as "our common and good friend."¹⁴ Then, on 3 September Evelyn sent his own proposal to Boyle:

I propound, that since we are not to hope for a mathematical college, much less a Solomon's house, hardly a friend in this sad Catalysis, and inter hos armorum strepitus, a period so uncharitable and perverse; why might not some gentlemen, whose geniuses are greatly suitable, and who desire nothing more than to give a good example, preserve science, and cultivate themselves, join together in a society . . . And, Sir, is not this the same that many noble personages did at the confusion of the empire by the barbarous Goths, when Saint Hierome, Eustochius, and others, retired from the impertinences of the world to the sweet recesses and societies in the East . . .?¹⁵

On 23 September Hartlib wrote Joachim Poleman in Amsterdam that his society would emerge publicly in a few days. However, Poleman wrote back cautionary words:

I would also like very much to be informed by you, how they will be able to carry out their plans without raising suspicion about others coming into possession of their [secret] philosophy . . . I wish also to understand that this society wants to proclaim itself publicly in other countries, as they must necessarily do with the knowledge and consent of the government in England . . . So must Parliament also be totally in agreement and satisfied with their plans; or otherwise they would drive such men out. I continue to wonder . . . what sort of pre-

¹² J. Worthington, *Diary*, I, 156–57.

¹³ D. Dickson, *Tessera*, 226.

¹⁴ J. Evelyn, *Diary*, III, 162n.3.

¹⁵ J. Evelyn, *Diary and Correspondence*, III, 116–20.

text and cover they may use to conceal and cloak their high gift of transmutation.¹⁶

Poleman's caution was apt, for Rosicrucian-minded royalists seemed to be making real progress. Evelyn had long been sympathetic to Rosicrucian ideals, though he was scornful of other millenarian sects, and in 1657 he had drafted an account of the fraternity:

About the beginning of this century appeared, in Germany, the *Rosicrucians*, a certain chymical sect, among whom was lately Jacob Böhm, their religion consisting mostly in contemplation of nature, raptures, and spiritualizing the progress of their great work; great enthusiasts, but of a silent, innocent deportment, for the most part; rather a sort of philosophic monks, conversing little with the world, save those of their own *adepti*.¹⁷

Evelyn's description of the Rosicrucians as "philosophic monks" foreshadowed his call two years later for virtuosos to become Christian hermits. Thus, in late 1659 Evelyn must have been curious about the rumored arrival in London of a mysterious adept, who possessed a valuable French Rosicrucian manuscript. Hartlib's son-in-law Frederick Clodius met him and studied the manuscript, and Thomas Vaughan "mightily hunted" after the *fratre*, who claimed that he was in contact with a Rosicrucian society in Lincolnshire.¹⁸ In 1659 another adept, "the noted chymist and Rosicrucian Peter Sthael, was recruited from Strasburg by Boyle.¹⁹ At Oxford Sthael formed a chemical club, whose members included Boyle, Wren, and the young John Locke.

For Hartlib, who viewed the Rosicrucians as rivals to the Antilians, these developments must have been worrisome. In November he wrote Boyle to assure him that the Antilians really possessed the secret of transmutation, and he eagerly awaited their printed *Declaratio* (which did not appear).²⁰ On 4 February 1660 he sought Evelyn's support by sending him Andreae's tracts, which he described as "the model of the Christian Society really begun in Germany: but the

¹⁶ D. Dickson, *Tessera*, 227–28.

¹⁷ See John Evelyn, *The History of Religion*, ed. R.M. Evanson (London: Henry Colburn, 1850), II, 267.

¹⁸ D. Dickson, *Tessera*, 217.

¹⁹ Anthony à Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, 3rd ed., ed. Phillip Bliss (London: Lackington-Allen, 1813), I, lii–liii.

²⁰ D. Dickson, *Tessera*, 230–31.

cursed Bohemian wars did destroy so noble and Christian a design.”²¹ In April he tried to link various foreign adepts to Antilia. He named “Gothier of Lyons in Fraunce one of the supposed Adeptus of Antilia here” and declared that “A Knight of Lincoln-shire S. Brownloe is held a Rosaecrucian and hath the Tesseram of Antilia.”

However, in early 1660 all these competing designs were mere castles in the air, with no official support nor serious organization. With the return of Charles II in May, a motley crew of virtuosos and projectors competed for his attention. Recognizing the king’s great interest in architecture and science, the poet John Dryden reversed his political position and adopted the virtuosos’ language in an attempt to gain royal patronage. In November 1658 Dryden had published “Heroic Stanzas” dedicated to the glorious memory of Oliver Cromwell, but after the Stuarts returned he unblushingly issued “Astraea Redux, On the Happy Restoration and Return of His Sacred Majesty Charles the Second.” He astutely praised Charles in older Stuart-Hebraic terms (“Thus banished David spent abroad his time,/When to be God’s anointed was his crime”), and he compared Monk’s mysterious actions to those of the divine architect.²² Dryden’s stream of poetic tributes to the restored Davidic king, divine architect, alchemical healer, and patron of science eventually won him pardon. He would subsequently become a Fellow of the Royal Society and a propagandist for the royalists’ virtuoso culture.

On 4 June 1660 a more cautious but still hopeful Hartlib wrote Worthington:

If Macaria were but once extant or acting, I am still of my former opinion, that they have enough for the purchasing of such things, & for the accomplishing of harder matters. The last secret information tells they are agreed. I believe that they will now within a very few days publicly appear. Some whisper the K[ing] should be a Teutonicus and lover of chymistry . . . I am very glad the press is making so good a progress in the desireable Mr. More’s Work . . . I am willing to serve him, by procuring if I can transcript of a letter or two of the supposed Brothers Ros. Crucis.²³

²¹ Ibid., 185; J. Evelyn, *Diary and Correspondence*, III, 131.

²² John Dryden, *The Works of John Dryden*, eds. E.N. Hooker and H.T. Swedenberg (Berkeley: California UP, 1956–), I, 24–26.

²³ J. Worthington, *Diary*, 194–98.

Because Henry More had been involved in bitter controversy with Thomas Vaughan over the latter's Rosicrucian claims, it seems that Hartlib wanted to bolster More's attacks on the emergence of royalist Rosicrucians.

However, it was not until the return of Moray in July that the speculative stones were quarried and joined together to make the "House of Solomon" an operative edifice. In March Moray had written from Paris to Alexander Bruce about "the design you know I have lying dormant."²⁴ In June Lauderdale, who was aware of Moray's scientific ambitions, ordered him to return to London. When Moray arrived, he immediately sought out the virtuosos who were interested in forming a society of natural philosophers. To gain the patronage of the king, it would be necessary to select known royalists as leaders in the effort. Though the moderate Wilkins continued to play a role, the more radical millenarians were not welcome. On 15 October Hartlib admitted that the new scientific society would not include the Antilians: "We were wont to call the desirable Society by the name of Antilia, and sometimes by the name of Macaria: but name & things is as good as vanished." Later in October Hartlib warned Worthington: "Of the Antilians we cannot hear a word more, save that they are said to prepare a certain apology, showing how they have been abused by those to whom they had yr. application." By November, when the society of sciences was launched, Hartlib, Dury, and the veterans of radical pansophism were not included.

The historic meeting took place on 28 November at Gresham College, where Moray, Bruce, Skytte, Boyle, Wilkins, and six other virtuosos attended a lecture by Wren and then gathered for a planning session in which "something was offered about a design of founding a Colledge for the Promoting of Physico-Mathematicall Experimentall Learning."²⁵ Hoping to emulate "the Manner in other Countreys, where there were voluntary associations of men into Academies for the advancement of various parts of learning," the group vowed to meet regularly in order to promote "Experimentall Learning." It was apparently from this date that Moray and Wren developed "a most friendly and inviolable attachment to each other."²⁶

²⁴ O. Airy, "Correspondence," 37.

²⁵ Harold Hartley, ed., *The Royal Society: Its Origins and Founders* (London: Royal Society, 1960), 31-35.

²⁶ C. Wren, *Parentalia*, 211.

The group appointed Wilkins as chair, and a list was drawn up of forty-one potential members, who were all acceptable to the royalist regime. Among the proposed recruits who maintained Rosicrucian interests were Digby, Henshaw, Ashmole, and Henry Oldenburg, while those with alleged Masonic associations were Denham, Evelyn, and Cowley. And of course Moray, Bruce, and Ashmole shared interests in both fraternities. Though Wilkins chaired the meeting, it was Moray who undertook the communication of the plan to Charles II.

On 29 November, one day after this auspicious gathering, Worthington wrote to Hartlib to express his disillusionment with the millenarian pretensions of the Antilians: "For my part the design did pretend to such high things and stupendous effects . . . that I could never build upon it."²⁷ Expecting to be ejected from Cambridge, Worthington hoped to find a "select society" that would be "less pretending to wonders" and that had some chance of achieving its more modest aims. Though he would not be included in the new Royal Society, the disillusioned Worthington would probably have approved of the plan presented by Moray to the king. The proposed motto, *Nullius in Verba*, was the antithesis to the overblown rhetoric of the millenarians. On 5 December Moray reported to the next meeting at Gresham College that "the King had been acquainted with the designe of this meeting. And he did well approve of it, & would be ready to give an encouragement to it."²⁸

Hartlib, who followed anxiously the activities of the royalist organizers, admitted to Worthington on 10 December his own disappointment at the vain promises of the secret network of Antilians:

... if I had known it [Antilia] would have proved a great nothing, I would never have given them that denomination w'ch I had used to give that society, w'ch I knew was real. The cheats of the Fraternity of the Holy Cross (w'ch they call mysteries) have had infinite disguises and subterfuges. The internuntii of the Antilians have the greater sin. But I dare not lay this fault upon the conscience of the heroick and candid soul of the chief internuntius to me, who believed verily that there was such a thing, tho' I have blamed him often for his over credulity, as it now proves.²⁹

²⁷ J. Worthington, *Diary*, 238–39.

²⁸ H. Hartley, *Royal Society*, 35.

²⁹ J. Worthington, *Diary*, 239–41.

Once again, Hartlib implied that the Rosicrucians—personified by the old royalist Vaughan and the new royalist Heydon—formed a rival movement to the Antilians.

On 17 December Hartlib reported to Worthington what he had learned about the Royal Society, adding that Skytte wanted to call on him. Someone had sent him the plan that Skytte presented to Charles II, which Hartlib believed contained Antilian elements:

Thus much is certain, that there is a meeting every week of the prime virtuosi . . . They desired his Maj.[esty's] leave that they might thus meet or assemble themselves at all times, w'ch is certainly granted. Mr. Boyle, Dr. Wilkins, Sr. Paul Neale, Viscount Brouncker are some of the members. Mr. Wren is chosen Register. I look upon this society as a previous introduction of the grand design here presented. His Maj.[esty] is sayd to profess himself one of these virtuosi.³⁰

It is curious that Hartlib did not mention Moray, the prime mover in the organization, or the Masonic founders Bruce, Evelyn, and Ashmole. Perhaps the stress of Moray and the Freemasons on the exclusion of religious and political discussion from the society seemed to distance it from Hartlib's millenarian, anti-Papist agenda.³¹ Skytte modified his own plan in order to accomodate the king's declaration of religious tolerance. On 14 January 1661 Beale sent to Hartlib the final plan drafted by Skytte, which included the following injunction:

Let there be no public exercise of religion other than according to the rites of the Church of England; and to those who are of diverse religion and rites, let liberty of conscience be allowed; but let them abstain from public exercises & disputations, and from all other other harmful devices for transfusing and propagating their opinions and customary rites.³²

Unlike Hartlib and the Antilians, the royalist virtuosos did not include conversion of the Jews and suppression of Catholics in their scientific agenda. In Hartlib's letter to Worthington, he followed his description of the Royal Society with news about the proselytizing activities of Dury and Boreel, who asserted that "the world may not expect any great happiness before the conversion of the Jews be first

³⁰ Ibid., 245–49.

³¹ For the Masonic influence on the society's rules, see D.C. Martin, "Sir Robert Moray, FRS," in H. Hartley, *Royal Society*, 246.

³² D. Dickson, *Tessera*, 260.

accomplished.”³³ In June 1660 Dury even had the effrontery to write a clumsily revised preface to a new edition of Thorowgood’s *Jews in America*, now dedicated to Charles II. In an effort to curry favor with the new regime, Dury reported that a young divinity student in Amsterdam had predicted in 1657 that Charles II would be restored in 1660, and now “we” hope that “your Family should be instrumental in the conversion of the Jews.”³⁴ This appeal fell on deaf ears, and Hartlib sadly recorded that Dury lost his “library keeper’s place at St. James’s,” where “one Ross, a Scotchman,” succeeded him.³⁵

Hartlib and Dury were especially disillusioned by their failure to find buyers for the Hebrew edition of the *Mishna*, produced by Boreel and Menasseh ben Israel and designed to further the conversionist campaign. Thus, they must have been nonplussed by the easy toleration granted to the Jews by Charles II. In 1661, when Boreel commissioned a Jew to translate the *Mishna* into a European language, it was Jacob Abendana who produced a Spanish version, “presumably for the Jews of Amsterdam,” which would then be translated into Latin for Christian readers.³⁶ However, Abendana evidently resented Boreel’s conversionist agenda, for he and others in the Jewish community frustrated the publication of the work (which remained in manuscript). Instead, Abendana would soon dedicate *The Kuzari* to Sir William Davidson, his Scottish royalist friend, who respected his Jewish identity and beliefs. Thus, as Hartlib reported resignedly on Charles II’s proposed Portuguese Catholic marriage, which was arranged by the Jewish royalist Coronel, he must have sensed the wind going out of the sails of the millenarians’ conversionist campaign. Moreover, the organizers of the Royal Society seemed determined to distance it from radical Protestant schemes.

Recalling the pacific Rosicrucianism of Jacobean Scots, Abraham Cowley—Moray’s friend and a probable Mason—published his *Proposition for the Advancement of Experimental Science* (1661), which called for utilitarian experiments and beneficial study of natural magic.³⁷

³³ J. Worthington, *Diary*, 245–49.

³⁴ Thomas Thorowgood, *Jews in America* (London: Henry Brome, 1660), dedication revised from 1648 original.

³⁵ J. Worthington, *Diary*, 199.

³⁶ Richard Popkin, “Two Treatises of Marsh’s Library,” in A. Coudert, *Judaeo-Christian Intellectual Culture*, 7.

³⁷ Abraham Cowley, *The Essays and Other Prose Writings*, ed. Alfred Gough (Oxford: Clarendon, 1915), 33–34.

Though he deemed impractical many of Francis Bacon's experiments, he accepted the "Catalogue of Natural Histories annexed to my Lord Bacon's Organon," and he urged the inclusion of "the Mysteries of all Trades" and "all Natural Magick or Divination" among the hard sciences to be studied (i.e., mathematics, chemistry, architecture, navigation, etc.). Like Cowley, Evelyn included a section of magic and astrology in the "Designe for a Library" for the society, a document produced at the request of Moray in spring 1661.³⁸

Though Hartlib never mentioned Moray, the leading role of the Scottish Freemason in the organization of the Royal Society was recognized by London citizens, one of whom—the shopkeeper John Graunt—wrote a panegyric to Moray. In Graunt's dedication to Moray of *The Natural and Political Observations . . . Made Upon the Bills of Mortality* (published in January 1662), he praised Charles II and his Scottish confidante for implementing Bacon's vision of science:

His Majesty being not onely by antient Right supremely concerned in matters of Government, and Trade, but also by happy accident Prince of Philosophers, and of Physico-Mathematical Learning, not called so by Flatterers, and Parasites, but really so, as well by his own personal Abilities, as affection concerning those matters . . . I do desire your [Moray's] leave to present [this treatise] . . . as it depends upon the Mathematicques of my Shop-Arithmetique. For you are not only his Majesties Privie Council for Philosophie, but also his Great Council. You are the three Estates, viz. the Mathematical, Mechanical, and Physical. You are his Parliament of Nature, and it is no less disparagement to the meanest of your number, to say there may be Commoners as well as Peers in Philosophie amongst you.

Graunt early recognized the enemies to the New Philosophy, and he praised Moray for his "Expeditions against the Impediments of Science." Linking such opposition to faction in religion, he made an unusually modern defense of pure research against mere utilitarianism:

Moreover, as I contend for the Decent Rights, and Ceremonies of the Church, so I also contend against the envious Schismatics of your Society (who think you do nothing unless you presently transmute Mettals, make Butter and Chees without Milk, and (as their own Ballad hath it, make Leather without Hides) by asserting the usefulness of even all your preparatory, and luciferous experiments being not the Ceremonies, but the substance, and principles of usefull Arts. . . . Nor

³⁸ Geoffrey Keynes, *John Evelyn: A Study in Bibliography with a Bibliography of His Writings* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 19.

I can better endure that your Excercitations about Air should be termed fit employment only for Airie Fancies, and not adequate Tasks for the most solid and piercing heads.

Moray showed Graunt's book to the king, who then recommended him as a Fellow of the Royal Society in February 1662. Charles further "gave this particular charge to them, that if they found any more such tradesmen, they should admit them."³⁹

The election of Graunt was an important sign of Moray's aim of religious tolerance and class egalitarianism within the society. A former Puritan who converted to Catholicism, Graunt won his place purely by merit. As with the Mylne family of masons, he won the right to stand on the level with nobles and kings. After the French savant Sorbière visited Moray and the Royal Society, he stressed the central role that "this learned Scotchman" played in developing the unique rules of the society: "the president and council are elective; they mind no precedence in the society," while "differences of opinion cause no manner of resentment" because of "their disinclination to all sorts of prejudice."⁴⁰ Historians of the society have long suggested a Masonic influence on these rules.

Graunt's linkage of the society's critics to political radicals pointed to the exclusion of the latter from membership. Though Hartlib was disappointed that Skytte's proposal was rejected and recognized that the "smoke is over" for his utopian *Macaria*, the disaffected Antilians were somewhat encouraged by the return to London of Henry Oldenburg, who had earlier shared the pansophic dreams of Dury and Hartlib. A native of Bremen, Oldenburg sympathized with the scientific goals of the Antilians, but he did not agree with their politics in England. Unlike Hartlib and Dury, he took the king's side against Parliament. Now recommended for membership in the Royal Society, Oldenburg provided a bridge between those royalists and parliamentarians who were interested in Rosicrucian science.

Oldenburg had been informed by Hartlib about the Antilian and Rosicrucian societies on the Baltic, and it seems likely that he investigated them when he travelled in the area in early 1661. On 1 August Christiaan Huygens wrote Moray that Oldenburg had arrived at The Hague from Bremen, where he had many singular experiences.

³⁹ Thomas Birch, *The History of the Royal Society* (London: A. Millar, 1756–57), I, 75.

⁴⁰ S. Sorbière, *Voyage*, 30, 36–38.

More importantly, Oldenburg had met in Amsterdam the alchemist Francesco Giuseppi Borri, who fled Italy after his conviction for heresy in 1660.⁴¹ Borri claimed that he received his alchemical secrets from the archangel Michael, and he founded a secret religious order whose members swore unquestioning obedience to him. Rumors circulated that he was secretly a Rosicrucian, and his genuine chemical skills provoked widespread interest in his experiments. Calling Borri "ce grand Lulliste," Huygens informed Moray that the Italian gave Oldenburg a letter for Digby, which contained a piece of his incombustible wood. Borri wanted Moray to report back to him after its demonstration before his "assembly." On 9 August Moray wrote that he looked forward to seeing Borri's wood and to hearing about Oldenburg's other encounters during his travels in the Baltic region.⁴²

Indicative of the society's interest in Rosicrucian-style chemistry throughout 1661 were Moray's presentation of his sympathetic powder, Digby's exhibit of Borri's incombustible wood, Oldenburg's paper on a Paracelsan *alkahest*, and Dr. Charleton's method of sublimating gold.⁴³ Moray continued to correspond with the Huygenses about Borri's alchemical claims and angelic visions, and his interest was shared by Robert Boyle and later by Isaac Newton. Though Thomas Vaughan, the most famous British exponent of Rosicrucianism, did not join the society, he commenced an intimate friendship and collaboration with Moray, who by May helped him gain royal employment as a Hermetic chemist and physician.⁴⁴ In December, in a letter strewn with Masonic stars and ciphers, Moray urged Alexander Bruce to send "stories of your distillations and experiments of the mercurial tube" to the society.⁴⁵

At the same meeting where Oldenburg discussed the *alkahest* (16 October), Moray announced that Charles II would become a member of the society. Encouraged by the king's interest in chemistry and patronage of alchemical courtiers, John Heydon determined to outdo his rivals Vaughan and Ashmole by publishing a stream of Rosicrucian treatises. On 12 November 1661 he wrote a dedication

⁴¹ Chr. Huygens, *Oeuvres*, III, 307; on Borri, see *Christina, Queen of Sweden: Exhibition at National Museum* (Stockholm, 29 June–16 October 1966), 369–70.

⁴² Chr. Huygens, *Oeuvres*, III, 311.

⁴³ T. Birch, *History*, I, 31, 42, 50, 76.

⁴⁴ F. Hutchinson, *Henry Vaughan*, 144–45.

⁴⁵ Kincardine MS.5050.f.92.

to the Duke of Ormonde, which he placed before the preface to *The Harmony of the World* (1662), in which he praised the Rosicrucians but criticized the parliamentary astrologer Lilly. After an exposition of the Cabalistic *sephiroth*, he concluded with "God save the King." On 15 March 1662, he dedicated to Sir Richard Temple *The English Physicians' Guide*, which rewrote Bacon's *New Atlantis* as an explicitly Rosicrucian tract. Expanding this into *The Holy Guide* (1662), Heydon tried to appeal to the Royal Society by stressing that Rosicrucians urge men "to labour more in this life," to "view the reason and nature of things, and to study "the pleasant Theatre of Naturall Things."

However, he also attacked Ashmole, a founding member of the Royal Society, who considered Heydon "an ignoramus and a cheat."⁴⁶ To bolster his appeal to the king, who admired Ashmole, Heydon proclaimed that he and his *fratres* believed that

... Episcopacy is the best form of Church Government, being most clear and purely professed, and cleansed from factious Presbyterians, Cromwellian Anabaptists, Jesuitical Quakers, and false prophets.

Also we use two Sacraments as they are instituted with all Forms and Ceremonies of the first renewed Church in England; we acknowledge Carolus Magnus Secundus, for our Christian head.⁴⁷

Perhaps recognizing the influence of Moray, Bruce, and Lauderdale on the king, Heydon boasted about two Scottish beneficiaries of his Rosicrucian physic, the otherwise unknown John Macklain and David Zeamons.

Heydon was possibly aware that his patron Buckingham, as well as the king and his Scottish confidantes, were Freemasons, for he included Masonic imagery that would have appealed to them. He spoke of a "Temple of Safety, Knowledge, Perfection or Acquired parts for refuge and protection," where initiated brethren work rough stones into harmony and beauty:

Now that there is such a thing as Beauty . . . in the adorning of buildings in all Ages . . . whether for example, a rightly cut Tetraedrum, Cube, or Icosaedrum, have more Pulchritude in them, then any rude broken bone lying in the field or high-ways; Or to name other solid figures, which though they be not regular properly so called, yet have a sealed Idea, and Nature, as a Cone, Sphere, or Cylinder, whether

⁴⁶ C. Josten, *Ashmole*, II, 734–35.

⁴⁷ John Heydon, *The Holy Guide* (London, 1662), 25; also, 4, 118.

the sight of these do not gratifie the minds of men more, and pretend to more elegancy of shape, then those rude cuttings or chippings of Freestone that fall from the Masons hands, and serve for nothing but to fill up the middle of the wall, and so to be hid from the eyes of man for their ugliness.⁴⁸

He then described his investigations of stone shapes and quarries in Arabia as well as England, subjects of great interest to Moray and Bruce, who hoped to contribute Scottish stone to the rebuilding of St. Paul's and other damaged edifices. Summing up his Masonic excursion, Heydon revealed a spiritualistic interpretation of stones that foreshadowed "speculative" Masonic symbolism:

... these stones, I say, gratifie our sight, as having a near cognition with the soul of man that is rational and intellectual, and therefore is well pleased when it meets with any outward object that fits and agrees with those congenite Ideas her own nature is furnished with: For Symmetry, Equality, and Correspondency of parts, is the discernment of Reason, not the object of Sense, as I in our *Harmony of the World* have in another place proved.

Linking the Rosicrucians with Fellows of the Royal Society and Freemasons, Heydon affirmed:

I am ravished with admiration of their miracles and transcendent mechanical inventions, for the salving the Phaenomena in the world; I may without offence, therefore compare them with Bezaliel and Aholiab, those skilful and cunning workers of the Tabernacle, who, as Moses testifies, were filled with the Spirit of God, and therefore were of an excellent understanding to find out all manner of curious work.⁴⁹

Heydon's campaign, with its overblown rhetoric and bombastic promises, provoked a satirical reply from Samuel Butler, who was familiar with Heydon's shifting political allegiances. Though Butler was a royalist, he worried about the occult interests of fellow royalists (such as Ashmole, Vaughan, and the Scottish courtiers) which seemed to portend a renewal of megalomaniacal enthusiasm and seditious prophecy. In December 1662 he issued his rollicking burlesque, *Hudibras*, which revealed his extensive knowledge of the occult traditions, radical sectarian politics, and Royal Society experiments. Butler had observed the activities of astrologers and alchemists during the Interregnum in London, and then in 1661–62 he lived in

⁴⁸ Ibid., 88–89.

⁴⁹ Ibid., "An Apologue for an Epilogue."

Wales, where he learned more about operative masonic traditions. Employed by Richard Vaughan (later Earl of Carbury), who made him steward of Ludlow Castle, Butler was charged with supervision of the masons who repaired the damage inflicted on the castle during the civil war.⁵⁰ At this time, Richard Vaughan was proposed as a founding member of the Royal Society, and when Butler returned to London he was privy to the proceedings and experiments of the society.

Unforgiving of the radical Presbyterians and Independents who brought such turbulence to England, Butler used insider's knowledge to lampoon their Judaized, Rosicrucianized phantasies. Also fueling his satire was an implicit Scotophobia, which he would later make explicit. His anti-hero Sir Hudibras was a pedantic Presbyterian knight (modelled on Don Quixote), who displayed typically Scottish Judaization:

For Hebrew roots, although they're found
To flourish most in barren ground,
He had such plenty as sufficed
To make some think him circumcised . . .⁵¹

Like John Napier and the Scottish diallers, Hudibras was a fanatic for mathematics:

In mathematics he was greater
Than Tycho Brahe or Erra Pater;
For he by geometric scale
Could take the size of pots of ale,
Resolve by sines and tangents straight
If bread or butter wanted weight,
And wisely tell what hour o' th' day
The clock does strike by algebra.⁵²

Like the radical Covenanters, he implemented his mathematical militancy in religious persecution:

For his religion, it was fit
To match his learning and his wit:
~Twas Presbyterian true blue,

⁵⁰ Samuel Butler, *Hudibras, Parts I and II, and Selected Other Writings*, eds. John Wilders and Hugh de Quehen (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973), viii.

⁵¹ Ibid., 3.

⁵² Ibid., 5. Butler scorns "Napier's Bones" and "moon dials" in part II; see *ibid.*, 191.

For he was of that stubborn crew
Of errant saints whom all men grant
To be the true church militant,
Such as do build their faith upon
The holy text of pike and gun,
Decide all controversies by
Infallible artillery,
And prove their doctrine orthodox
By apostolic blows and knocks;
Call fire and sword and desolation
A 'godly thorough reformation.'⁵³

For "Covenant and the cause's sake" and for "The Solemn League and Covenant," Hudibras was determined to carry on the struggle to suppress popular-pagan-Papist entertainments.

Hudibras's theological hair-splitting was rendered more dangerous by the half-baked Hermetic enthusiasms of his squire, Ralpho. Like many Independents, the uneducated Ralpho received divine illuminations:

His knowledge was not far behind
The knight's, but of another kind,
And he another way came by 't:
Some call it 'gifts' and some 'new light';
A liberal art that costs no pains
Of study, industry, or brains.⁵⁴

Exposed to the bewildering barrage of English translations of occult and millenarian works published during the Interregnum, the ignorant Ralpho assumed mystical and prophetic powers:

Thus Ralph became infallible
As three- or four-legged oracle,
The ancient cup, or modern chair;
Spoke truth point-blank, though unaware;
For mystic learning wondrous able
In magic, talisman and cabal,
.....

He Anthroposophus and Fludd
And Jacob Behmen understood,
Knew many an amulet and charm

⁵³ Ibid., 7; also, 23, 45.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 15-18.

That would do neither good nor harm;
 In Rosicrucian lore as learned
 As he that *vere adeptus* earned.

Despite Butler's implicit mockery of Hermetic royalists such as Vaughan and Digby, his main targets were the radical Protestants who still posed a threat to the restoration government. That the irreverent Charles II was delighted with *Hudibras* is not surprising, and royal approval stimulated popular approval (nine editions were printed within twelve months). Butler's sense that Rosicrucianism was identified with potentially seditious Scots received reinforcement when William "Egyptian" Ramesey published *De Venenis: or, a Discourse of Poysons* (1663), in which he defended his father David Ramsay and himself against suspicions of disloyalty. Ramesey then called for a revival of Hermetic, Cabalistic, and astrological medical techniques, which all "the greatest physicians" and "Brethren of the Rosy Cross" proclaim as necessary.

From his patron Richard Vaughan, Butler perhaps learned of the Rosicrucian interests of Moray (who supported Thomas Vaughan), Bruce, and other Scottish members of the Royal Society. Even worse, visiting Swedish virtuosos—whom Moray welcomed—spread reports that there were many Rosicrucians in England.⁵⁵ Thus, in December 1663 Butler issued Part II of *Hudibras*, in which he broadened his targets to include Rosicrucian-style proponents of the "New Science." When Butler sent Hudibras and Ralpho to seek Rosicrucian assistance from Sidrophel, an astrologer modelled on Lilly, he linked Rosicrucian claims in supernatural science to the virtuosos' claims in natural science:

He [Sidrophel] had been long towards mathematics,
 Opticks, philosophy and statics,
 Magic, horoscopy, astrology,
 And was old dog at physiology.

.....

He'd read Dee's prefaces before
 The devil and Euclid o'er and o'er.⁵⁶

⁵⁵ According to Olaus Borrichius, who visited in 1663; see E. Seaton, *Literary Relations*, 293.

⁵⁶ S. Butler, *Hudibras*, 163–66.

While Lilly and Heydon labored to gain royalist favor, Butler reminded his readers of the broken oaths and shifting loyalties of various Interregnum occultists and sectarians. Recounting in detail the breaking of oath after oath in the 1640's and 1650's, Ralpho justified the Independents' betrayal of the Presbyterians' Solemn League and Covenant:

For breaking of an oath and lying
Is but a kind of self-denying,
A saint-like virtue, and from hence
Some have broke oaths by providence,
Some to the glory of the Lord
Perjured themselves and broke their word . . .⁵⁷

In response, Hudibras rationalized the oath-breaking by Presbyterians (his "synod of rabbins") by appealing to Jewish precedent:

The rabbins write, when any Jew
Did make to God or man a vow
Which afterward he found untoward
And stubborn to be kept, or too hard,
And three other Jews o' th' nation
Might free him from the obligation:
And have not two saints power to use
A greater privilege than three Jews?⁵⁸

The issue of oaths of secrecy and loyalty was also raised in the Royal Society, where some members argued their necessity for protection of technological discoveries and defense against religious persecution. At the same time, Heydon affirmed the importance of such oaths for Rosicrucian secrets, noting that Pythagoreans, Egyptians, and alchemists all required them. Heydon was especially concerned about "pulpit politicians" and informers who accused him of seditious writing. After his arrest in 1663, Heydon wrote that,

He was falsly accused but lately of writing a Seditious Book and imprisoned in a Messengers Custody. But his Noble friend the Duke of Buckingham, finding him innocent and alwaies for the King he was then discharged, and indeed this glorious Duke is a very good and just Judge: and although some speak slightly of him, he studies the way to preserve his King and Countrey in peace plenty and prosperity . . .⁵⁹

⁵⁷ Ibid., 135.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 139.

⁵⁹ John Heydon, *The Wise Man's Crown: or, the Glory of the Rosie-Cross* (London: Samuel Speed, 1664), A7.

Heydon was arrested again in 1664, and he complained about “these Sophistical Sicophants” who persecuted him:

... one very proudly with a full mouth and loud voice aspersed me with Atheisme in St. Paul’s Church in his morning Sermon the eight of may, before the Lord Mayor and others, amongst a promiscuous people, Railing against the Rosie Crucians, who Art and Nature united . . .⁶⁰

In order to shore up his threatened position, Heydon issued *Theomagia, or the Temple of Wisdom* (1664), with a fulsome dedication to Buckingham and testimonials from Kenelm Digby, John Booker, John Gadbury, Dr. Robert Turner, George Starkey, and other Hermeticists. “K.D.” (Digby) recommended the book as a preventative against sectarian schisms and boasted of Heydon’s rising status in the world:

I am confident if mens Minds were but truly fixt upon this Temple, they would not prove such weather Cocks, to be turned about with the Wind of every false Doctrine, of some Atheistical Astrological vaine opinions: we should then be free from those disorders which threaten destruction to the Soul, and distraction to the Common-wealth.⁶¹

As though confirming Butler’s linkage of Rosicrucianism to Scottish Presbyterians, Heydon included George Starkey among his supporters. Born in Bermuda to radical Scottish Presbyterian parents, Starkey was educated at Harvard, where he gained fame as an alchemist. Moving to London in 1650, he collaborated in chemical enterprises with Dury and Hartlib, while he criticized the work of Thomas Vaughan.⁶² Claiming a correspondence with the mysterious adept “Eirenaeus Philalethes,” Starkey provoked the interest of Boyle and other virtuosos. Like Hudibras and Ralpho, Starkey was a political opportunist who followed his tribute to the regicide Robert Tichborne in 1657 with royalist pamphlets three years later. Starkey dedicated to Charles II *The Dignity of Kingship* (1660), in which he attacked Milton’s *Readie and Easie Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth*, while he labored to defend “the sober, modest and pious Presbyterians” versus the “schismatic” Independents, whom he claimed to loathe.⁶³ Starkey’s alchemical treatises, published under the pseudonym Eirenaeus

⁶⁰ Ibid., B2.

⁶¹ J. Heydon, *Theomagia*, G3.

⁶² William R. Newman, *Gehennical Fire: the Lives of George Starkey, an American Alchemist in the Scientific Revolution* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1994), 4–7, 54–83.

⁶³ D. Dickson, *Tessera*, 190–91, 254.

Philaethes, gained him a reputation as a Rosicrucian, while his political pamphlets gained him the character of "a dull Presbyterian." That Butler's suspicions of his continuing radicalism were probably accurate is suggested by Hartlib's dream in late 1661 of establishing Antilia in Bermuda, Starkey's homeland.

Besides the Scottish Starkey, Heydon listed other supporters with northern ties. Among the many aristocrats who favored his Rosicrucian art, Heydon named the king's cousin Charles Stuart, Third Duke of Lennox and Richmond, currently a member of the Scottish Privy Council. He also hinted that he had access to Monk's restorationist plans in Scotland in 1659, and he claimed to have friends among Monk's entourage in London.⁶⁴ Thus, he dedicated "a work vindicating the Heydonian or Rosie-crucian philosophy" to Richard Brooke, "late cavalier to the King, and now one of the Duke of Albemarle's gentlemen."⁶⁵ Though little is known about Brooke, he was acquainted with Ashmole and evidently shared his Hermetic-Masonic interests.⁶⁶ Heydon boldly claimed that the Rosicrucians "Would be joyful to have him [Brooke] as their guide and governor."

In three more works published in 1664–65, Heydon praised Prince Rupert, royalist son of the Winter Queen, with whom he collaborated on alchemical experiments, and Aubrey de Vere, Earl of Oxford, who was interested in Jewish studies.⁶⁷ He again stressed the Jewish origins of Rosicrucian science, utilized Hebrew letters, and cited the writings of Josephus on geomancy, Ibn Ezra on sun dials and spheres, and Abraham the Jew on alchemy. Drawing much from Lull, he placed Duns Scotus and Roger Bacon in the Rosicrucian tradition. Significantly, he also cited Joseph Scaliger's works on Jewish history as important to understanding Hebrew mathematics and Cabala. Perhaps recognizing the support of Thomas Vaughan by important Masons (Charles II and Moray), Heydon now presented a conciliatory dialogue with "Eugenius Philaethes."

As noted earlier, when Heydon listed "Mr. Flood" as a witness to his Rosicrucian-Restoration prediction in 1659, he probably referred

⁶⁴ J. Heydon, *Theomagia*, Book III, 133.

⁶⁵ *CSP, Domestic Series, of the Reign of Charles II* (London, 1860), III, 431.

⁶⁶ C. Josten, *Ashmole*, III, 1003.

⁶⁷ J. Heydon, *Wise Man's Crown*, dedications; *Psonithonphanchia* (London: William Gilbertson, 1664), 25, 33–35, 64; *Elhavarena* (London: William Gilbertson, 1665), 1, 67, 130.

to Dr. Lewen Fludd, who carried on the Hermetic medical work of his uncle Robert. At this time, there was a revival of interest in Robert Fludd's writings among the virtuosos as well as Hermeticists. In 1659 an English translation of his most Cabalistic work, *Mosaicall Philosophy*, was published and three years later he received high praise from Thomas Fuller, who included him in *The History of the Worthies of England* (1662), dedicated to Charles II. Fuller claimed that Robert was "of the order of the Rosa-Crucians," and he made clear that Rosicrucianism was not inimical to the Anglican church: "Sure I am, that a rose is the sweetest of flowers, and a cross accounted the sacrest of forms or figures, so that much of eminency must be imported in their composition."⁶⁸

Fuller also praised builders and repairers of churches (those "who have erected us synagogues, places for God's public worship"), who struggled against the iconoclastic "barbarism" of the Interregnum.⁶⁹ Thus, his explicit linkage of Robert Fludd with the Rosicrucians was especially significant in 1662, for one year later the Company of Accepted Masons included a copy of "The Constitutions of the Freemasons," contributed by a "Mr. Flood," in an inventory of its possessions. The apparent merging of Rosicrucian and Masonic interests in the Fludd family perhaps attracted Christiaan Huygens, for the Dutch savant called on Lewen Fludd, "un chimiste charitable," when he visited England in summer 1663. That the Huygenses were interested in Rosicrucianism has already been noted and, like Moray, they probably connected it with Stuart Freemasonry.

Since Moray's return to England, he had corresponded with his Dutch friends about alchemy and signed his letters with Masonic emblems—thus implying that the Huygenses were fellow initiates.⁷⁰ In London father and son spent much time with Moray, whom they considered the "soul" of the Royal Society, and Christiaan was elected a Fellow in June 1663. It was perhaps through their influence that the works of Robert Fludd were recommended to the "Mechanicall Committee" of the Society in 1664.⁷¹ This committee had both a Masonic and Scottish component, for its members included Moray,

⁶⁸ Thomas Fuller, *The History of the Worthies of England* (1662), ed. P. Austin Nuttall (London: Thomas Tegg, 1840), 148.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 43–44.

⁷⁰ Chr. Huygens, *Oeuvres*, III, 130, 307, 311, 322, 356; IV, 132; *Supplement*, XXII, 598–99, 603.

⁷¹ M. Hunter, *Establishing*, 115.

Buckingham, Denham, Edward and Robert Harley, and the northern nobles Elgin, Argyll, and Tweeddale.⁷²

The contacts claimed by the flamboyant Heydon with veterans of an earlier Stuart Rosicrucian-Masonic milieu raise questions about the relationship between his type of Rosicrucianism and that practiced by Freemasons such as Moray, Buckingham, Ashmole, and (probably) the Huygenses. That these men played significant roles in the Royal Society suggests a continuing cross-fertilization between the public society and the secret fraternities. In Heydon's dedication of *Theomagia* to Buckingham, he portrayed the Rosicrucians as builders of a Temple of Wisdom which would serve natural and supernatural science:

The Wisdome and Learning of the Rosie Crucians hath been much recommended unto us by Ancient Writers, and not without good cause; considering that they have delivered Arts, and Liberal Sciences to the World as a man may gather by the testimony of The Wisemen of the East, and all the Philosophers that ever were. But time which consumeth all things, hath bereft us of the Knowledge of such wisdome; and there is but the fragments and scattered pieces of these Arts . . . Now the Rosie Crucians men, carefull to preserve all goodly and great things, have . . . repaired, maintained and kept entire the first Part of the Temple of Wisdome, which they are not content to set down literally, and there end; but have adjoyned thereto two Parts more, beautified with practical Interpretations and rare Experiments.⁷³

Emboldened by the testimonials of his supporters, Heydon gave unusually explicit details of the Jewish techniques of Rosicrucian science. The Holy of Holies of the Temple of Wisdom was to be entered by a process of Cabalistic meditation upon the names and attributes of God:

. . . there is but one god and one power, yet he is named by diverse names, for the multitude of the species . . . As all souls are reduced to the one soul of the world or universe . . . therefore it is meet to know the sensible properties of these Idea's, and perfectly to intellectualize them by the way of the more secret Analogy: The learned Hebrews say that . . . certain Divine powers, or as it were Members of God, which by ten *Sepheroths* . . . have an influence on all things Created, through the high things even to the lowest . . . then by the *Primum Mobile*, bestowes the gift of being to all things, filling the whole universe

⁷² T. Birch, *History*, I, 406.

⁷³ J. Heydon, *Theomagia*, A4-a5.

both through the Circumference and Centre, whose particular intelligence is called *M rattrom* [Metatron], that is, the Prince of Faces, whose duty it is to bring others to the face of the Prince: and by him the Lord spake to Moses.⁷⁴

As noted earlier, a form of Metatron mysticism would be taught in certain *Rose-Croix* degrees of *Écossais* Masonry in the eighteenth century.

Heydon praised the efforts of Capnio, Pico, Agrippa, Valerianus, Khunrath, and Fludd in reviving the Cabalistic art. He also gave rare praise to Postel, whose works on the *Sepher Yetzirah* and *Zohar* were not well-known in England:

But of all the Moderns, who have spoken of these Celestial Characters, *Postell* is the only man, who seemeth to have had the greatest knowledge in them; as may appear, out of the greatest parts of his Books; among which, that which he hath written upon the *Jethsira*, gives us an Account of what himself had experience of . . . After the world had once been satisfied in the Probability of this his Doctrine, he then intended to make a full discovery of all these Secrets, in his commentaries upon the *Zohar* . . .⁷⁵

Heydon argued that the shapes and sephirotic symbolism of Hebrew letters and numbers contained earthly and heavenly secrets, which could be deciphered by methodical meditation. By mastering this ancient art, he had been able to foresee the downfall of Cromwell, the descent of Monk, and the restoration of Charles II. The similarity of Heydon's prophetic vision to that of Scottish second-sight is obvious. Moreover, he may have learned about the Scottish Mason's claims to Rosicrucian arcana and Lullist mnemonic expertise. Certainly, Samuel Butler believed that contemporary Rosicrucians practised a Lullist version of Cabalistic meditation—one that he associated with unsavoury Scots.⁷⁶ Butler may have learned this from Buckingham, who became his employer and theatrical collaborator.

In Butler's satirical essay on "An Hermetic Philosopher," he noted that the Rosicrucians perform their wonders by "Virtue and Dint of Numbers, which they will have to run through the three Worlds like a Ladder of Ropes, holding the same Proportion in them all, and

⁷⁴ Ibid., Book I, 28.

⁷⁵ Ibid., Book I, 143–45.

⁷⁶ Samuel Butler, *Prose Observations*, ed. Hugh de Quehen (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), 162, 216; and *Characters*, ed. Charles Davis (Cleveland: Case Western Reserve UP, 1970), 151.

the universal Privilege of *the great Secret*." Moreover, they combine their Jewish manipulations with Lull's Art of Memory:

They will pick Mysteries out of Syllables and Letters, as Juglers do Money out of their Noses—This they have learned of the Forefathers of Anagrams, the *Rabbins*. Beside theis they have admirable Methods to dispose and lay up Learning in, like those odd Contrivances in Cabinets, where nobody can tell how to find it but themselves. Lully's *Ars Brevis* is one of these, wherein *Magnitudo*, *Bonitas*, and *Quomodo* are several concealed Drawers, in which they, that have any Learning, may lay it up safe . . .⁷⁷

In his notebook, Butler elaborated on his readings in Lull's Art of Memory, which he placed with other occultist "Cabals of Canting":

Raymund Lully interprets Kabal (out of the Arabique) to signify Scientia Superabundans, and no doubt it is a very superfluous Thing; his *Ars Brevis* is a Dvice to pack up knowledge in a Small case (like a pair of Twises) of Nine Letters, which being set upon Magnitudo, Bonitas, Quomodo &c (like Shopkeepers Markes) will suddenly instruct the most Ignorant in all Manner of Learning. This his Commentator Cornelius Agrippa (being very Partial to this Vanity of Science) strains so hard to make good, that he affirms of his own knowledg (in spite of Reason, or Probability) that Illiterate and Decrepit old men, with Boys of Ten yeares of Age, have, in a short Space, been inabled, by this Sole Art to dispute with wisest Doctors of his Times in all manner of learning . . . But I wonder who was ever the wiser for his 12 Principles in a Circle, like the figures on a Dial?⁷⁸

It is significant that Butler saw similarities between Lull's mnemonic wheels and sundials, for he may provide a clue to the Scottish masons' delight in designing and constructing ever more complicated dials. He also linked Lull's tradition with Flamel, Cardano, and Scaliger—figures who had long influenced Stuart loyalists.⁷⁹ At this time of close collaboration between Moray and Lauderdale, the latter's collection of manuscripts on architecture, dialing, and fortification, as well as rare works by Lull, Cardano, Scaliger, Alsted, and Kircher on the Art of Memory, suggests a continuing Scottish-Masonic tradition.⁸⁰ While Moray and Bruce corresponded with the Huygenses

⁷⁷ Ibid., 150, 156.

⁷⁸ S. Butler, *Prose*, 134–25.

⁷⁹ See *ibid.*, 352–55 for De Quehen's interesting commentary on Butler's sources in Lull, Cardano, and Scaliger.

⁸⁰ Lauderdale, *Bibliotheca*, part I, 16, 26; part II, 4, 6, 16, 17, 29, 32.

about the design and construction of sun dials, the Dutch savants continued to collect Lullist works, including the 1663 edition of Lull's *Arbol de Sciencia*.⁸¹ Perhaps recognizing the interest of the Scottish Fellows of the Royal Society in Lullism, Dr. Beale offered to send a set of "mnemonical scrolls" to the society in May 1663.⁸² As noted earlier, Jonathan Swift would later assert that without "a Key to Raymundus Lullius" it is "impossible to come at the Quintessence of Free Masonry."⁸³

Heydon also described the state of prophetic trance that could be achieved by Cabalistic meditation, and his description sheds some light on the hints at meditative vision in the writings of Moray and the Vaughan brothers:

The divination natural . . . springeth from the internal power of the soul: This is of two sorts, the one Native, the other by Influxion: Native is ground upon this supposition, that the Minde when it is withdrawn and collected into itself, and not diffused into the Organs of the Body, hath from the natural power of its own Essence, some prenotation of things future; and this appears most in Sleep, . . . of extasies, propinquity of death, more rare in waking, or when the body is healthful and strong, and this state of the Minde is commonly procured by abstinencies, and those observances which do most of all retire the Minde unto itself . . . But Divination by Influxion is grounded upon another supposition, that the Minde is a Mirour or Glass should take a secondary kind of Illumination from the foreknowledge of God and Angels, unto which the same state and regiment of the Body, which was to the first, doth likewise conduce; for the same sequestration of the Minde, causeth it more severly to employ its own Essence, and makes it more susceptible of Divine Influxions, save that the Soul in Astromancy and Geomancy by Influxion is rapt with a kind of fervency and impatiency, as it were of the Deity, wherewith it is possest . . . but in native Arts, the Minde is enfranchis'd, and neerer to a repose rather, and an immunity from labour.⁸⁴

Like Moray, whose sexual abstinence amused the more rakish courtiers, Heydon boasted of his own chastity, which he explicitly linked with his meditative and visionary capacity. This psychosexual discipline was aimed at achieving a vision of the Divine Sophia or *Shekinah*, a goal that Butler comically mocked in *Hudibras*. During Ralpho's

⁸¹ Kincardine MS.5050. ff.72-73; Chr. Huygens, *Oeuvres*, XXII. Supplement, 27.

⁸² T. Birch, *History*, I, 234.

⁸³ J. Swift, *Prose*, V, 328.

⁸⁴ J. Heydon, *Theomagia*, Book III, 214.

Rosicrucian visionary process, he utilized meditation on numbers and Dee-style crystal gazing, until he achieved his psycho-erotic goal:

He'd extract numbers out of matter
And keep them in a glass, like water
.....

By help of these, as he professed,
He had first matter seen undressed,
He took her naked, all alone,
Before one rag of form was on.⁸⁵

The tendency of Scottish Fellows of the Royal Society to link Cabalistic, Rosicrucian, and Masonic interests was reinforced by the visit of Samuel de Sorbière, French virtuoso and historiographer to Louis XIV, in summer 1663. Sorbière had earlier been influenced by Menasseh ben Israel, "the most learned rabbi of his time," who "somewhat corrupted his mind" (i.e., interested him in Jewish lore).⁸⁶ On his way to England, he called on "the famous Borri" at Amsterdam, and he recorded the Rosicrucian's creed (based on the Cabalistic sexual quaternity) that made "the Virgin Mary to be one of the Four Persons that Constituted the Divine Essence." Borri claimed to have "the quintessence of Lull," and some princes gave him pensions in hopes of getting the Philosopher's Stone. In London Sorbière spent much time with Moray and the Huygenses, who were interested in Borri's work.⁸⁷ They introduced him to their Scottish friends, who included Moray's nephew Colin Lindsay (grandson of Balcarres, the "Rosicrucian Earl"), whom Moray served as guardian.⁸⁸

The Scots showed Sorbière "the great stone under the Coronation chair," called "Jacob's Stone," and they confided in him about Monk's "premeditated design" and collaboration with the Presbyterians and Covenanters to organize the Restoration. Sorbière also learned that Hyde (now chancellor and Earl of Clarendon) had accused Moray of sorcery, probably because of the Rosicrucian interests of Moray and Balcarres. When Sorbière published this information in Paris in 1664, it provoked an indignant counterblast from Thomas Sprat, F.R.S., who rejected the Scots' leading role in the Restoration

⁸⁵ S. Butler, *Hudibras*, 18.

⁸⁶ See S. Sorbière, *Voyage*, xvii, 2, 78-82.

⁸⁷ Con. Huygens, *Briefwisseling*, IV, 366.

⁸⁸ A. Lindsay, *Lives*, I, 1-2.

and defended Clarendon's version of events.⁸⁹ Sprat also rejected the Frenchman's "long story" about Borri, who seemed a "foolish charlatan."

Much to Sprat's annoyance, Sorbière accused the English of laziness ("they glory in their sloth"), while he praised Moray and the Scots for intellectual energy and scientific expertise. He especially admired their salutary influence on King Charles and Prince Rupert, who are lovers of "the curiosities of nature":

It was wonderful, or rather a very edifying thing, to find a person [Moray] employed in matters of state, and such excellent Merit, and one who had been engaged a great Part of his life in warlike commands, and the Affairs of the Cabinet, apply himself to making machines in St. James' Park, and adjusting telescopes. All this we have seen him do with application, and undoubtedly to the confusion of most of the courtiers, who never mind the stars, and think it is a dishonour to concern themselves with anything, but inventing new fashions: wherefore, Sir, I beheld with astonishment the eagerness with which this learned Scotchman advanced the knowledge of nature, and the conveniences of life, which might be attained in this science of Mechanism.⁹⁰

He further noted the egalitarian relations of the Fellows with the king, who was eager to learn about and participate in experiments performed by a broad assortment of scientists and artisans. Though Sorbière was familiar with the Rosicrucian interests of many members, it is unclear whether he learned about the Masonic influence on the rules of the society.

The Masonic-Rosicrucian influence on virtuoso culture was further exemplified in the relationship of the Scottish brethren to a young countryman who visited London in 1663–64. The twenty year-old Gilbert Burnet was the learned and lively son of a staunch royalist, and he became the protégé of Alexander Bruce, now Second Earl of Kincardine. Burnet noted that Kincardine "was the first man that entered into friendship with me" and that "it was from him that I understood the whole secret of affairs; for he was trusted with everything" and "had a wonderful love for the King."⁹¹ Moray took special pains with the intellectual and ethical development of Burnet,

⁸⁹ Thomas Sprat, *Observations on Monsieur de Sorbière's Voyage into England, Written to Dr. Wren* (1665; London, 1708), 151–53, 162.

⁹⁰ Sorbière, *Voyage*, vii, 30–31.

⁹¹ "Kincardine," *Spottiswoode*, II, 211–12.

whom he molded according to his Masonic philosophy. He introduced the young Scot to Boyle, Wilkins, Wallis, More, and other Fellows, and he spurred his interest in Rosicrucianism.

While in London, Burnet disguised himself and went to a meeting of Rosicrucians, where the speaker warned that several had come to "spy out the liberty of the Society, and make their observes upon them."⁹² The speaker was probably Ezerel Tonge, who collaborated in chemical experiments with Moray and who contributed botanical papers to the Royal Society.⁹³ When Burnet returned to Scotland in June 1663, he regaled his friends with tales of his experiences, but one auditor was shocked by his "old women's tales, as of a strange sort of people, whom he called, the Rosycrucians, whom I had never heard of before."⁹⁴

Encouraged by Moray to study mathematics and mechanics, Burnet pursued these subjects under the tutelage of Sir Robert Fletcher of Saltoun. He also spent much time with Kincardine, who in 1664 repossessed "The Palace" at Culross and determined to reconstruct it from the Cromwellians' damage. When Burnet moved back to London in March, he brought Moray information about Kincardine's projects in operative masonry, which encouraged their hopes to supply stone for building projects in London. Moray had earlier asked Edward Marshall, the king's master mason, for "patterns of all the good stone" to send to Kincardine, who in turn would send samples of Scottish stone to London.⁹⁵ Burnet informed Moray that Kincardine "might have a raised a stone 30 feet long & 3 or 4 feet square," and he reported back to Kincardine that Moray wanted "to know if you can do so still, for perhaps such will be sought for Paul's." Both Moray and Kincardine played a mentoring role with Burnet, while they used him as a masonic go-between. Thus, it seems certain that Burnet was also initiated into Freemasonry.

Moray got Burnet elected to the Royal Society, and in May he sent his protégé on to Holland and France, with instructions on what to study and whom to meet. Influenced by his mentors' masonic interests, Burnet recorded his observations of certain craftsmen

⁹² Robert Wodrow, *Analecta* (Edinburgh: Maitland Club, 1842), II, 371.

⁹³ H. Oldenburg, *Correspondence*, VI, 564.

⁹⁴ T.E.S. Clarke and H.C. Foxcroft, *A Life of Gilbert Burnet* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1907), 47.

⁹⁵ Kincardine MS.5050.ff.102, 131.

(evidently masons), noting that he paid attention to “all their mechanical arts and the peculiar engines and instruments they made use of.”⁹⁶ However, Burnet’s “chief business” in Amsterdam was to be “well acquainted with all the religions there,” and he especially sought out Jewish instructors. Given Moray’s correspondence with the Huygenses at this time, they probably introduced Burnet to Rabbi Leon and his circle of Jewish savants. Burnet recorded:

I conversed much with the Jews, and was two hours a day with a master there, and had much discourse with Ahoab and Musaphia, that were esteemed very learned . . . I heard him [Ahoab] preach . . . I shall never forget one thought which was indeed a noble one: he was preaching on our conformity to the nature of God, and said that God made man after his own image, or to be shadow to himself (according to the Hebrew word); now a shadow had no substance in itself, and was only a ruder draught of the body whose shadow it was, and moved always as the body moved. So he applied it thus: that a man was to have no will of his own, but that in all things he ought to follow God, and be a sort of a representation (though but a rude one) of his perfections.⁹⁷

Isaac Ahoab was a friend and panegyrist of Leon, who was possibly Burnet’s “master.”⁹⁸

Burnet’s admiration for his Jewish instructors was significant, because he disapproved of the “intolerable peevishness and ill-nature among our exiles at Rotterdam.” Thus, like Moray, he may have seen a universalist Judeo-Christian religion as an antidote to Scotland’s continuing religious divisions. As he later remembered,

One thing I drank in at Amsterdam . . . which is never to form a prejudice in my mind against any man because he is of this or that persuasion; for I saw so many men of all persuasions that were, as far as I could perceive, so truly religious that I never think the worse of a man for his opinions . . . I became likewise much in love with toleration by what I saw in Holland, for there was only a difference of opinion among them, but no heat nor anger raised by it, every one enjoying his own conscience without disturbance . . .⁹⁹

⁹⁶ Gilbert Burnet, *A Supplement to Burnet’s History of My Own Time*, ed. H.C. Foxcroft (Oxford: Clarendon, 1902), 94.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 91.

⁹⁸ See Jacob Jehudah Leon, *Alabaņas de Santidad* (Amsterdam, 1671), Dedication.

⁹⁹ G. Burnet, *Supplement*, 93.

From Holland Burnet moved on to Paris, where Moray arranged for his meetings with various French Protestants and savants. But Moray especially wanted his protégé to observe the preaching styles of Protestants and Catholics in France, for "he thought if our English sermons were pronounced as the French did theirs, the business of preaching would be a great perfection among us." Burnet reluctantly developed an admiration for the Jesuits' "methods of their order and their way of training up youth." He also tried to find some masters of the occult sciences:

I looked often to find out some that understood the mystical divinity, and that followed the rules of it; but I could never fall on any. I was told they were persons who would not be seen; so whether this was only an excuse, or if there were really any such among them, I do not know. I had also much conversation with . . . my lady Balcarres' daughter, who I found had more mystical notions than any I spoke with.¹⁰⁰

Despite Burnet's oblique reference to "mystical divinity," it is clear that he was looking for Rosicrucians. As noted earlier, the Balcarres family was steeped in Rosicrucian learning, and he confided to a Scottish friend in Paris his experience at "a Rosicrucian meeting" in London, where the speaker exercised some kind of hypnotic power over him:

. . . the speaker began by mentioning that a spy was present who boasted of his great memory, and who "should hear their great truths but should not be able to carry away one word." Burnet, piqued by this, composed himself to exact attention; but after a "charming" and . . . perfectly intelligible discourse, he came away unable to remember a sentence. This he attributed to preternatural powers.¹⁰¹

When Burnet returned to England and then Scotland, he collaborated in the political and masonic activities of Moray, Kincardine, and Lauderdale, who virtually ran Scottish affairs for Charles II.

Though little more is known about the *Rose-Croix* elements in Scottish Freemasonry during the next decades, a cluster of Rosicrucian, Cabalistic, and Lullist themes would emerge in the Masonic writings of Robert Samber and Jonathan Swift in 1722–24.¹⁰² Because

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 96–98.

¹⁰¹ T. Clark and H. Foxcroft, *Life of Burnet*, 172–73.

¹⁰² On Samber's writings, see Edward Armitage, "Robert Samber," *AQC*, 11 (1898), 103–32.

both authors claimed to draw on “ancient” Scots-Irish (versus “modern” English) traditions of Freemasonry, it is important now to examine the state of operative and speculative Masonry in England, Scotland, and Ireland during the reign of Charles II.

While Charles was still at Breda in 1660, the issue of Masonic leadership in England was raised by rival claimants to the post of master mason to the king. John Stone, son of Charles I’s master mason Nicholas Stone, travelled to Breda to press his case. He claimed that his father had “for his loyalty” been “sequestred, plundered and imprisoned,” and that he himself had “lately horsed and armed a man for your Majesties service under Sir George Booth, and endeavoured to endear as many of his friends to hazard in the same service.”¹⁰³ As noted earlier, Stone had published an unusual pocketbook to help royalist military masons. Given Monk’s alleged usage of Scottish Masonry to plan his march south through Yorkshire, Stone’s claim to have supported Booth, who organized royalist support in York, suggests a possible Yorkist Masonic link as well. It may be relevant that the Scottish earls of Balcarres, Elgin, and Crawford-Lindsay were involved in the secret planning for Booth’s rising and that Moray worried about Booth’s subsequent imprisonment.¹⁰⁴

In Stone’s appeal to the king, he criticized Edward Marshall, his rival claimant and a leading London operative mason, as “a Pretender . . . who in no kind served your Majesty.” When Marshall claimed to have been granted the post of master mason by Charles I (in reversion after Nicholas Stone’s death), Charles decided to grant each man a post, with Stone at Windsor Castle and Marshall at the Office of Works. However, the king was not so forgiving of John Webb, former assistant to Inigo Jones, who was the most competent and experienced architect in England. The question of one’s status as an “honest” mason emerged as a test of past loyalty and future preferment. “Honesty” became synonymous with the capacity to maintain secrecy and loyalty in difficult circumstances.

In early May 1660 Webb was commissioned by Parliament to prepare Whitehall Palace for the return of Charles II, and he subsequently petitioned the king for the post of Surveyor of Works. However, questions were raised about his role as an “honest” crafts-

¹⁰³ H. Colvin, *History*, V, 3–4.

¹⁰⁴ F. Routledge, *Calendar . . . Clarendon*, IV, 165, 203.

man. While Charles was in exile, Webb designed domestic houses for parliamentarians as well as royalists. Bold observes that Webb was "politically a trimmer at best," and he "compounded his sin by entertaining the idea of official employment during the Interregnum."¹⁰⁵ Much to Webb's chagrin, Charles honored the promise he made to the poet John Denham in 1649, that he would gain the post upon the death of Inigo Jones, which occurred in 1652. While secretly serving as a liaison between English and Scottish royalists, Denham was probably initiated into Masonry by the latter. Moreover, his "Panegyrick on His Excellency, the Lord General George Monk," printed in late 1659 as a broadside, hinted at his role in Monk's secret strategy.¹⁰⁶

When Webb continued to plead his case, he stressed his own practical experience:

Mr. Denham may possibly, as most gentry in England at this day have, some knowlege in the Theory of Architecture; but nothing of the practise, soe that he must of necessity have another at his Majestie's charge to doe his businesse; whereas Mr. Webb himselfe designs, orders, and directs whatever given in command, without any other man's assistance.¹⁰⁷

The king, who was genuinely interested in architecture, relented, and in June 1660 he granted the reversion of Denham's post as Surveyor to Webb. But Denham, who hoped to later sell the office, stopped Webb's reversion from passing the Great Seal.

For the position of Paymaster in the Office of Works, the Duke of Buckingham—who proved himself an "honest" Mason—managed to get his long-time servant Hugh May appointed. May had accompanied Buckingham to Scotland in 1650–51, when the duke was probably initiated into Freemasonry.¹⁰⁸ He then carried out secret transactions for Buckingham and the exiled court, which gave him the opportunity to make an "intelligent study of Continental buildings, particularly in Holland and France, where he travelled from 1656 to 1660."¹⁰⁹ Though May's original appointment involved financial

¹⁰⁵ John Bold, *John Webb: Architectural Theory and Practice in the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989), 3.

¹⁰⁶ J. Denham, *Poetical Works*, 100, 105, 111, 149–52.

¹⁰⁷ H. Colvin, *History*, V, 5.

¹⁰⁸ H. Colvin, *Biog. Dict.*, 646–48.

¹⁰⁹ John Harris, *William Talman: Maverick Architect* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1982), 19.

expertise, he gradually took on real architectural and masonic duties. Evelyn considered May “a very ingenious man,” and he was praised for his mastery of the technicalities of architecture. When Buckingham undertook his own ambitious building schemes, he was able to draw on his friend’s masonic studies—which were perhaps first stimulated in Scotland.

In August 1660 the king honored his friendship with Robert Moray by appointing his brother William Moray as “sole master of works, overseer, and director general of his majesty’s buildings in Scotland.”¹¹⁰ Robert Moray hoped for a revival of architecture and masonry in Scotland, and he corresponded with Kincardine about the quarrying and sale of Scottish stone for royal building projects in London. As a close friend of Wren, Robert was privy to Wren’s long-time interest in building, even though Wren had not yet become a practising architect. In 1660 Wren presented to his fellow virtuosos a paper on “New Designs tending to Strength, Convenience, and Beauty in Building.”¹¹¹ Moray, Wren, Hooke, and other organizers of the Royal Society considered architecture a mathematical science, and they were interested in the practical problems of stonework and building materials.¹¹² That the Masonic virtuosos connected their architectural agenda with their scientific agenda is suggested by the contribution of Masonic emblems by Evelyn and Ashmole to proposed coats of arms for the Royal Society.¹¹³ Evelyn further praised Charles II as “our Solomon,” who through his support of the society will construct a “Solomon’s House” and “Ampitheatre of Wisdom.”¹¹⁴

Despite the king’s enthusiasm for architectural revival, he soon realized that major changes would be necessary in the attitudes of the London populace and the training of craftsmen. In August 1661 he issued a “Proclamation Concerning Building,” in which he complained that the building orders of Charles I, James I, and even Elizabeth I were not obeyed.¹¹⁵ The Surveyor of Works was ordered to prosecute violators, because the failure to build in brick and stone

¹¹⁰ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 74–75.

¹¹¹ M. Hunter, *Science and Shape*, 63.

¹¹² J. Bennett, *Mathematical Science*, 87–89.

¹¹³ M. Hunter, *Establishing*, 17, 41–42.

¹¹⁴ See Evelyn’s preface to his translation of Gabriel Naudé, *Instructions Concerning Erecting a Library* (London: G. Bedle and T. Collins, 1661), A3–5.

¹¹⁵ Robert Steele and Earl of Crawford, eds., *Tudor and Stuart Proclamations, 1485–1714* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1910), I, 399–400.

made the city vulnerable to frequent fires and rendered it less beautiful than was proper for a great capital. The paucity of stone work during the Interregnum perhaps provoked Wren's comment that there were no masons in London at that time. Among many Protestants, the iconoclastic propaganda of the Cromwellian years still colored their attitudes towards regal and ecclesiastic architecture.

The king learned of similar problems in Scotland, which he determined to address. To repay the loyalty of the Perth Freemasons (and to fulfill the old Rosicrucian prophecy?), Charles promised in July 1661 to provide funds for rebuilding the Tay bridge, "that laudable and pious design of our royal grandfather and father."¹¹⁶ Probably advised by Moray and Lauderdale, he upgraded the position of Master of Works in Scotland by knighting William Moray and extending his jurisdiction. In May 1662 he named Sir John Veitch, former Master of Works under Charles I, to serve with Sir William, and both were officially appointed as "general wardens in Scotland of all trades pertaining to building (including hammermen and makers of artillery as well as the more obvious crafts)." Stevenson observes that the official changes were important for the development of Freemasonry:

The joint wardens were given power to hold warden courts, incorporate craftsmen into companies, appoint wardens, overseers, deacons, and other officers, and summon conventions or assemblies. They were to have "a proper seall for their office," and sheriffs, justices, and magistrates were to assist them in their work.

For the first time the office of general warden was partially separated from that of master of works . . . Now, in the 1660's, the general warden had become a crown office.¹¹⁷

Stevenson suggests that Robert Moray had ambitious plans for a reorganization of Freemasonry in Scotland, but it also seems likely that his ideas influenced a similar reorganization in England. According to Anderson, Charles II acted as patron of the revived lodges in London, which assimilated certain Scottish traditions:

[Charles II] approv'd their Choice of Henry Jermyn, Earl of St. Albans as their Grand Master, who appointed Sir John Denham his Deputy Grand Master, Sir Christopher Wren, Mr. John Webb Grand Wardens.

¹¹⁶ R. Mylne, *Master Masons*, 103.

¹¹⁷ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 75.

According to a Copy of the old Constitutions, this Grand Master held a General Assembly and Feast on St. John's Day 27 December 1663, when the following Regulations were made.¹¹⁸

If Anderson's account was accurate, then Charles engineered the election of St. Albans as "Grand Master," a post that seems equivalent to the newly defined "General Warden" in Scotland. Though St. Albans's post was not explicitly a crown office, it was much closer to William Schaw's earlier position in Scotland than Inigo Jones's in England. One of the regulations stated that "for the Future the said Fraternity of Free Masons shall be regulated and govern'd by one Grand Master, and as many Wardens as the said Society shall think fit to appoint at every Annual General Assembly." Recently returned from his post as ambassador to France, St. Albans participated in the architectural revival, in which he planned St. James Square, commissioned Wren to build a handsome church at St. James, and constructed St. Albans Market.¹¹⁹

The reorganization of Freemasonry stimulated the seventy-two year-old Gerbier to campaign for a royal appointment. Though forced to remain incognito, Gerbier had assisted Denham, Ashmole, and the Scottish poet John Ogilby in designing the four triumphal arches for Charles II's coronation in 1661.¹²⁰ Using Solomonic and architectural imagery, they made the *tableau vivant* a celebration of royalist Masonic ideals. In 1662 Gerbier emerged from his anonymity and dedicated to the king *A Brief Discourse Concerning the Three Chief Principles of Magnificent Building*. Gerbier emphasized the high Vitruvian status of the architect, who works "by the power of the great Architect and Director of all things." Then, in a revealing Masonic passage, he affirmed:

All Master-Workmen . . . ought to be careful to the due esteem of their Art, since its dimensions and rules come directly from Heaven, when the Great Architect and Surveyor of Heaven and Earth, prescribed the Rules and particular Orders for the building of a floating Pallace (Noah's Ark) and the glorious matchless Temple of Salomon and the perfect House of Prayer.¹²¹

¹¹⁸ J. Anderson, *Constitutions* (1738), 101.

¹¹⁹ "Henry Jermyn, Earl of St. Albans," *DNB*; J. Evelyn, *Diary*, III, 251, 299.

¹²⁰ Katherine S. van Eerde, *John Ogilby and the Taste of His Time* (Folkestone: William Dawson), 31–49; John Ogilby, *The Entertainment of His Most Excellent Majestie Charles II*, ed. Ronald Knowles (Binghamton: William Dawson, 1988).

¹²¹ Balthazar Gerbier, *A Brief Discourse . . . of Magnificent Building* (London, 1662), 2.

This claim of Solomonic tradition did not issue from Vitruvian writings but from Masonic lodge histories.

Gerbier claimed that Charles I had made him Master of Ceremonies for life and that "the Place of Surveyor Generall was also intended to me (after late Inigo Jones)." He praised Charles II's architectural taste, for "you have seen more stately palaces and buildings than all your ancestors and may be a pattern to all future posterity." In a second dedication to the Lords and Commons of Parliament, he revealed that he had presented to the king a draft of a design for "a sumptuous gate at Temple Barr," and he hoped to contribute to the plans for improved streets in London. Arguing that St. Paul's and the royal palaces should be rebuilt "gloriously," Gerbier recommended the Escorial "for bigness and solidity."¹²² He further advocated the Dutch practice by which "the builders made models of their Town Houses, showing divers experimental architects the great importance of the models." Appealing to the inflated prestige of Charles's "Grand Master" and "Grand Warden," he reiterated the Masonic traditions of the Divine Architect and his Master Work-men.

Encouraged by the response to his pamphlet, Gerbier issued a sequel, *Counsel and Advice to All Builders; For the Choice of their Surveyors, Clerks of the Works, Bricklayers, Masons, Carpenters, and other Work-men therein Concerned* in early 1663. This odd treatise—filled with fawning dedications, mystical perorations, and practical instructions—functioned almost as a manifesto of royalist Freemasonry. First, the queen mother Henrietta Maria was praised as the direct descendant of Henri IV, who made "Building worth a part of the employment of his heroick Genius." Then, in a panegyric to William Juxon, Archbishop of Canterbury, Gerbier utilized the symbolism of operative masonry and speculative Freemasonry:

Having observed that your Grace doth rebuild, what distracted times hath demolished . . . [this treatise] doth proceed on the indisputable prescription, according unto which Solomon's Temple was built and certainly, My Lord, it ought to pass for the best; nor have the Heathens, Grecians, Romans, omitted the same in their compleatest Structures . . . many of them have affected to observe in the dimensions of their Edifices the sixty cubits in length, twenty in breadth, and thirty in height of Solomon's Temple . . . May the blessing thence continually attend your Grace, that after his . . . propagating of Temples in bodies

¹²² Ibid., 37, 16.

of flesh, Your Grace may appear as one of the corners of that Temple, whereof that of Solomon's Building was a Tipe.¹²³

While using Masonic terminology to define the courtiers' service to state and religion, Gerbier also linked their studies in the natural sciences with those in the Hermetic sciences. In his dedication to Lord Brouncker, "President of the Royal Society of Philosophers and its Fellows," Gerbier praised Brouncker's knowledge of geometry, which Plato required for his Academy, and of "all the appurtenances to the Mechanics." More importantly, the president "hath matchless knowledge of the building of that, whereof the original was made, by the direction of the supream Architect, to wit, the Arke."

Gerbier then gave a wierd account of his conversation with "a chief of the wild people" (an American Indian), while Charles II was at Breda. The Indian revealed that he had received news from his people that the king was returning to his throne, "when no living creature was come from Europe into that part of America to signifie that news." The prophecy was revealed to them by "their MACK-BOUY," and it confirmed that "Spirits not body'd with material bodies, know things most secret." Praising "the great Apollo of this Monarchy" for encouraging the Royal Society "to dive in matters most sublime," Gerbier pointed to Digby's Hermetic experiments and the Marquess of Dorchester's "true powder of projection, that of Hermes Trismegistus, that Aurum Potabile, which will serve to open Heavens Gate."

Urging the courtiers to undertake private as well as public architectural projects, Gerbier hoped their workmen would study his treatise. He then gave practical criticism and advice about the current state of operative masonry and its associated crafts. He criticized the carelessness and brevity of training of apprentices, "who too soon become Journey-men."¹²⁴ In order to equal "the most Prudent and Solid Builders, the free Masons" of Italy, France, Holland, and Germany, English masons must learn geometry and how to "perform according unto such exact patternes made in good Wainscote." The architect or surveyor should study Michelangelo, Raphael, and Durer, in order to master the "respectful observations of the Dimensions the Creator hath been pleased to give to the Microcosme Man," for

¹²³ Balthazar Gerbier, *Counsel and Advice to All Builders* (London: Thomas Mabb, 1663), dedication.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 7-58.

they "have found that there is a perfect concordance amongst them." The Clerk of Works should encourage masons to strive for a perpetual fame, like the great Roman stonecarvers. Since master workmen are crucial to success, masons must remember that "the foundations of the Temple of Solomon were made of smooth hard stone," while carpenters should "imitate Solomon, in the procuring of precious wood" and be proud that they "are of an honest Joseph's profession."

Unfortunately for Gerbier, his projected patron Archbishop Juxon died in June 1663, and the king elevated to the Canterbury position Gilbert Sheldon, who had already chosen a designer for his projects—the twenty-nine year-old mathematician Christopher Wren. Sheldon had long planned a special building at Oxford for academic convocations, and in April 1663 Wren showed the Royal Society a model of his design for the Sheldonian Theatre, to be sited next to the Bodleian Library.¹²⁵ In July Wren wrote Brouncker about his plan to entertain Charles II with his "Designes in Architecture," when the king visited the Royal Society. Sensing an upstart rival in the untested Wren, Gerbier dedicated to Henrietta Maria a revised edition of his discourse on *Magnificent Building* (1664), in which he argued the necessity of experienced, practical architects and masons to successful building projects. While the queen mother planned the reconstruction of Somerset House, she should avoid the "walking Master Workman," who carries his compass in his pocket from job to job. Gerbier evidently supported the establishment of stationary lodges, as was the practice in Scotland, in order to better train designers, stoneworkers, and carpenters.

When Henrietta Maria returned to London in July 1662, she took a keen interest in the resumption of work on Somerset House, according to the design she had earlier worked out with Inigo Jones. Because of the loyalty and sufferings of the widow of Charles I, the renovation of Somerset House was given special spiritual significance by royalists. As the work progressed in 1663–64, various poetic tributes were issued. In an anonymous poem "Upon Her Majesty's New Buildings at Somerset House," the author linked architectural reconstruction to royal clemency and tolerance. "While Peace from hence, and you were gone,/Your houses in that storm o'erthrown," the edifice of state became a ruin. Now, the royalist architectural vision

¹²⁵ J. Bennett, *Mathematical Science*, 87.

finds new expression in Somerset House: "This, by the Queen herself designed,/Gives us a patterne of her mind."¹²⁶ In another poetic tribute, "On the Queens Repairing Somerset House," Cowley gave voice to the building itself:

When God (the Cause to Me and Men unknown)
 Forsook the Royal Houses, and his Own,
 And both abandon'd to the Common Foe;
 How near to ruine did my Glories go?
 Nothing remain'd t'adorn this Princely place,
 Which Covetous hands could Take, or Rude Deface.

.....

... the gasping walls were cleft,
 The Pillars sunk, the roofs above me wept ...

.....

... for as in Kings we see
 The liveliest Image of the Deity,
 We in their Houses should Heaven's likeness find,
 Where nothing can be said to be Behind ...¹²⁷

Like Cowley, who connected architectural renewal with Charles II's determination to bolster science, improve technology, and expand trade, Gerbier advocated a central role for the Royal Society. He reminded the courtiers of his own attempt to form a scientific academy, which was destroyed by a Cromwellian mob as "a receptacle of Royallists."¹²⁸ When the iconoclasts shouted "down with all Arts and Sciences," Gerbier lamented that the English seemed determined to "let but Paris, Salamanca, and Padua have such a prerogative." Among the returning royalists who had spent years in exile on the Continent, there was a strong commitment to internationalize England's intellectual, scientific, and economic enterprises—a commitment that provoked Puritan charges of creeping Papism. That the king and his favorite courtiers were admirers of Louis XIV and French culture irritated the traditional xenophobia of radical English Protestants.

Thus, when Evelyn drew heavily on French theory and practice in his contribution to the king's architectural agenda, he fueled the controversy over royalist architecture. He had earlier launched his campaign against the iconoclasts with *Sculptura* (1662), which pro-

¹²⁶ For the contested authorship (Waller or Denham?), see E. Waller, *Poems*, 189–90, and J. Denham, *Poetical Works*, 328.

¹²⁷ A. Cowley, *Poems*, 433–44.

¹²⁸ B. Gerbier, *Counsel*, dedication to Marques of Worcester.

vided a history of engraving from Bezalel and Aholiab, Hermes Trismegistus, Jones, Kircher, and Comenius. Now he dedicated *A Parallel of the Ancient Architecture with the Modern* (1664) to Charles II and Denham, Master of Works. He also presented a copy to the Royal Society.¹²⁹ The title-page bore an emblem of a cherub holding a compass and square, with the sub-title "made English for the Benefit of Builders." Like Gerbier, Evelyn criticized the current training of architects and masons in England. His work was a translation of Fréart's French treatise of 1650 and pointed to the period of alleged cross-fertilization between French and Scottish masonry.

Evelyn argued that French workmen "are generally more intelligent in the proper expressions of the terms of the Arts . . . than ours for the most part are."¹³⁰ He called upon "our young Architects and their Subsidiaries" to bring about a miraculous improvement of their buildings in a short time, in order to serve the spiritual and political regeneration of the nation: "It is from the asymmetric of our Buildings, want of decorum and proportion in our Houses, that the irregularity of our humors and affections may be shrewdly discern'd." He also urged potential employers of architects—"our Nobility and Gentry"—to undertake serious study of the art; unfortunately, too many "either imagine the Study of Architecture an absolute non-necessary, or forsooth a diminution to the rest of their education."

Evelyn shared with Gerbier, Moray, and Franco-Scottish masons a belief in the Solomonic traditions of the fraternity. Drawing on his conversation and collaboration with operative masons, he stressed the importance of their role in implementing the Solomonic and Vitruvian ideals of the architect: "the learning of our Architect with the diligence of our Workman . . . may serve to rear a Tabernacle, not build a Temple, there being as much difference between speculation and practice in this Art, as there is between a Shadow and Substance." Evelyn added to Fréart's treatise his own drawing of the Arch of Titus in Rome, which he argued was designed by a Roman witness of "the divine Architecture of the Temple of Solomon" before its destruction in 70 A.D. This "architect" then produced a careful replica of "the principal Spoils of the Temple," thus preserving for

¹²⁹ T. Birch, *History*, I, 482; Kerry Downes, "John Evelyn and Architecture: a First Inquiry," in J. Summerson, *Concerning Architecture*, 28–39.

¹³⁰ See Roland Fréart, Sieur de Chambry, *A Parallel of the Ancient Architecture with the Modern*, trans. John Evelyn (London: Thomas Roycroft, 1664), 104–05, 113, 120–21.

posterity an accurate depiction of the sacramental objects of the Jews.

At this time, Evelyn was on intimate terms with Moray, who shared his concern about religious extremists, from the Puritans to the Jesuits. Sympathetic to the mystical Jansenist movement among French Catholics, Moray encouraged Evelyn's translation of *Mysterion tou Anomias, or another Part of the Mystery of Jesuitism* (1664), which deplored the Jesuit persecution of Jansenists.¹³¹ In January 1665 Moray gave the book to Charles II, who thanked Evelyn for writing it. In the eighteenth century, the shared interests of many Jansenists and *Écossais* Masons were perhaps foreshadowed by Moray's and Charles II's hopes for religious conciliation and scientific progress.

Besides these spiritual aspects of Moray's Masonic beliefs, Evelyn shared his interest in the historical, theoretical, and practical aspects of the craft. In a manuscript note on the early history of the "Free-masons Fraternity," Evelyn later added in the margin, "My worthy Friend Sr Rob: *Murrey*, was of this society; and first related it to me."¹³² Throughout 1664 Moray solicited the cooperation of Denham and "all the Masons," while he tried to arrange the purchase and transport of Kincardine's marble blocks for use in London.¹³³ On 24 November Moray reported happily to Kincardine that "besides what I said last of the King's Mason, this day the King askt me where those marble quarries are, saying it would do well for his own building he meant here at Whitehall, which he is now thinking of." While Moray and Kincardine continued to use Burnet as an intermediary for news about operative masonry, Evelyn became privy to their bonds of Masonic friendship. Moreover, Moray confided to Evelyn his belief in the mystical extensions of such friendship. As with Kincardine earlier, Moray explained the symbolism of his Mason's Mark to Evelyn, who subsequently utilized a similar Mark.¹³⁴

When Moray encouraged John Beale to write a volume of royalist propaganda for the Royal Society in 1664, Evelyn collaborated with Beale on a design for the frontispiece which had suggestive Masonic themes. Hunter notes that the basic conception was "a pictorial celebration of Francis Bacon and the Stuart monarchy in an architec-

¹³¹ John Evelyn, *The Miscellaneous Writings of John Evelyn*, ed. William Upcott (London: Henry Colburn, 1825), 499–500; David Mitchell, *The Jesuits: A History* (London: Macdonald, 1980), 171–73.

¹³² British Library, Evelyn MS. 173 p. 10; quoted in Ron Heisler, "John Evelyn and Freemasonry," *AQC*, 109 (1996), 262–63.

¹³³ Kincardine MS.5050.ff.124–29.

¹³⁴ D. Stevenson, "Masonry," 417–18.

tural setting," which would include "columns of the major classical orders to symbolise the three Stuart kings."¹³⁵ When Evelyn revised the design for Thomas Sprat's *History of the Royal Society* (1667), he placed the figures of Charles II, Bacon, and Brouncker "under an architectural composition," while a building in the background suggests Solomon's House in the *New Atlantis*. Though Yates suggests a Rosicrucian tribute to John Dee in the winged female angel carrying a trumpet of fame, Hunter counters that "there is no need to see a specific Rosicrucian allusion in this figure."¹³⁶

However, Moray and Evelyn did share Dee's interest in royalist colonization projects, which they viewed as economically beneficial to the disadvantaged citizens of the realm and as intellectually conducive to broadening the minds of the upper classes. Moreover, they perceived a connection between Masonry and colonization. When Evelyn dedicated his architectural treatise to Charles II, he especially praised "those noble, and profitable amaanities of Your Majesties Plantations, wherein You most resemble the Divine Architect."¹³⁷ Evelyn's allusion was not mere rhetoric, for he probably knew from Moray about the significant Masonic component in the development of Tangier, the north African colony given to the king as part of his Portuguese bride's dowry. In fact, the dramatic history of "British" Tangier over the next two decades foreshadowed the fate of future Scottish (and Irish) international ventures, by which initially optimistic but gradually embattled royalists would take their Masonic customs into foreign lands.

Routh notes that the marriage treaty with Portugal, which transferred possession of Tangier, marked a definite stage in the growth of English foreign policy:

Cromwell's dream of a league of crusading Protestant powers was over; Dunkirk, which the Protector had intended to make his starting-point for an advance against Papal Europe, was sold to France soon after the acquisition of Tangier. The two transactions mark the beginning of a new policy, which substituted a bold and hopeful scheme of colonial expansion for the useless tenure of French or Dutch cautionary towns.¹³⁸

¹³⁵ M. Hunter, *Science*, 194–97.

¹³⁶ F. Yates, *Rosicrucian*, 192.

¹³⁷ R. Fréart, *Treatise*, dedication to king.

¹³⁸ E.M.G. Routh, *Tangier: England's Lost Atlantic Outpost, 1661–1684* (London: J. Murray, 1912), 5.

Since 1656 Monk had urged the acquisition of Tangier; after the Restoration, he influenced the king to make a serious colonization effort. Charles became enthusiastic about the project, and he envisioned a prosperous, multi-ethnic port that would provide a gateway to new international markets. As in his other colonies, the king ordered a policy of religious toleration to enable Protestants, Catholics, Moslems, and Jews to work together.

In 1661 Charles asked Wren to design the fortifications and great stone pier or breakwater ("the Mole") that would be necessary to develop and defend the port.¹³⁹ Though Wren declined a post in Tangier on grounds of health, he drafted a treatise on how "To build a Mole into the Sea, without Puzzolan Dust, or Cisterns."¹⁴⁰ After the project was launched, the hundreds of military engineers, masons, and craftsmen sent to Tangier carried out what Routh calls "the greatest engineering work till then attempted by Englishmen."¹⁴¹ As we shall see, the work was initially directed by Scots (and Scottish-connected Swedes), and most of the construction work was performed by Scots and Irish. From the beginning, Moray and his Masonic colleagues were anxious to settle "a body of Scots" in Tangier, and they probably discussed the proposed construction projects with Wren, who would long maintain an interest in the architectural challenges of the colony.¹⁴²

Before Tangier could be settled, it was necessary to evacuate Dunkirk, which had been captured and fortified by Cromwell in 1658. At the Restoration, Monk sent Sir Edward Harley to serve as governor and to supervise the construction of new fortifications at Dunkirk. Because the Harley family would provide an important link between Scottish and English Freemasonry over the next decades, it will be useful to trace their Masonic contacts. During the Civil War, Edward Harley initially fought for Parliament but then joined Thomas Fairfax in a withdrawal from Cromwellian politics. Throughout the Interregnum he maintained his Presbyterian sympathies, while he pursued his interests in military and domestic architecture (consulting John Webb on construction plans).¹⁴³ Edward was also interested

¹³⁹ J. Bennett, *Mathematical*, 89.

¹⁴⁰ C. Wren, *Parentalia*, 239.

¹⁴¹ E. Routh, *Tangier*, 343–49.

¹⁴² O. Airy, *Lauderdale Papers*, I, 147.

¹⁴³ *HMC: 14th Report. Portland*, 213; H. Colvin, *Biog. Dict.*, 1030.

in the experiments conducted by William Backhouse, the Hermetic "father" of Ashmole, and he employed Ezerel Tonge, the Rosicrucian scientist and preacher.¹⁴⁴

In early 1660 Edward collaborated with Monk in the final stages of the Restoration, while his brother Sir Robert Harley acted as an intermediary between the Presbyterians and the king's court in exile.¹⁴⁵ In May Charles sent Robert from The Hague with a dispatch to England, while Monk sent Edward to govern Dunkirk. Edward appointed Tonge as regimental chaplain, and the two planned to build a new chapel for the troops. The crucial fortification work was carried out by Hans Ewald Tessin, the Swedish engineer and Edinburgh Freemason, who was joined by Robert Harley's regiment of English soldiers and military masons.¹⁴⁶ In September 1661, after the king sold Dunkirk to France, Monk ordered Robert to transfer his regiment to Tangier, where Tessin and his son—also a military engineer—were to join him.¹⁴⁷ However, Robert did not travel with the regiment to Tangier, and he soon came under Anglican suspicion because of His "sectarian associates," who included most of his former officers.¹⁴⁸ Charles II, who respected Edward Harley, was "continually disturbed because he is represented to be a notorious Presbyterian," whose Protestant zeal was ill-adapted to the rule of a Catholic town. Henrietta Maria and the Anglican faction prevailed, and Charles reluctantly removed Edward from the governorship of Dunkirk.

In his place the king appointed Andrew Rutherford, a Scottish Catholic recommended to him by Louis XIV. Rutherford had taken no part in the Civil Wars in England but instead gained a high reputation as commander of the Scots Guard in France. Like earlier compatriots, he struggled to protect the Guard as an ancient Scottish institution against the attempted inroads of French officers.¹⁴⁹ Given the alleged Masonic traditions of the Scots Guard, it is suggestive

¹⁴⁴ C. Josten, *Ashmole*, II, 576n.1.

¹⁴⁵ Samuel Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, eds. Robert Latham and William Matthews (Berkeley: California UP, 1970–83), I, 147.

¹⁴⁶ *HMC: 14th Report. Portland*, 262.

¹⁴⁷ Osmund Airy, "Letters Addressed to the Earl of Lauderdale," *Camden Miscellany*, VIII (1883), 19; Edwin Chappell, *The Tangier Papers of Samuel Pepys* (London: Navy Records Society, 1935), 69.

¹⁴⁸ Basil Henning, *The House of Commons, 1660–1690* (London: History of Parliament Trust, 1983), II, 495–97.

¹⁴⁹ O. Airy, "Letters . . . Lauderdale," 11.

that Rutherford sought the support of St. Albans, the English Grand Master, while he passionately defended the Scottish privileges of the Guard ("which belonged to the nation, not to me"). Rutherford received an application from James St. Clair of Roslin to serve as his secretary in Dunkirk. In his youth St. Clair had been "bound apprentice in London," evidently in the masons' craft.¹⁵⁰ He then moved to France, where he lived for a while with M. de la Porte, Great Prior and Knight of Malta. His family was still considered the hereditary protector of Freemasonry in Scotland, and he himself was "much taken up with building, and addicted to the Priests." At Dunkirk St. Clair worked for Rutherford "whilst the fortifications were persisting."

During the transfer of the governorship of Dunkirk, Rutherford and Edward Harley became good friends, and the Scot recommended him to Moray and Lauderdale as a man who shared their spiritual and intellectual interests. The support of Edward was especially important for Rutherford, because he faced increasing anti-Scottish prejudice among the English troops, who included many former Cromwellians. As he wrote to Lauderdale, "I have 4000 spies about me," and one "that was confident hath acted against me and the principles of freindschipp."¹⁵¹ Probably through his virtuoso contacts, Rutherford persuaded Archbishop Sheldon to raise money to construct the regimental chapel at Dunkirk.¹⁵²

When Edward Harley returned to England, he developed a confidential friendship with Moray, who corresponded with him from Whitehall and Edinburgh.¹⁵³ Both Robert and Edward Harley became Fellows of the Royal Society, and they served with Denham, Moray and the Scottish members Elgin, Argyll, and Tweeddale on the Mechanical Committee in 1664.¹⁵⁴ It was probably through Edward that Moray met Tonge, who continued to work for the Harleys after Dunkirk. Tonge subsequently collaborated with Moray in Rosicrucian studies and chemical experiments.¹⁵⁵ According to John Aubrey, an F.R.S. and friend of Moray, the Harley brothers were both interested in occult phenomenon. Robert Harley told Aubrey about an

¹⁵⁰ R. Hay, *Genealogie*, 165–66.

¹⁵¹ O. Airy, "Letters . . . Lauderdale," 23.

¹⁵² Bodleian Library: Dolben MS. Add.C.302. ff.92–93.

¹⁵³ *HMC: 14th Report. Portland*, 271, 304–05, 338.

¹⁵⁴ T. Birch, *History*, I, 41, 99, 294, 406.

¹⁵⁵ G. Burnet, *History*, II, 156.

"Obsessus" in Scotland who was carried in the air several times in full view of his fellow soldiers.¹⁵⁶ Edward showed Aubrey his "consecrated Berill" or shew-stone, which responded to magical calls by revealing "either the Receipt in Writing, or else the Herb," which were used by a minister and a miller for medical cures. Aubrey noted that "the Spirits or Angels would appear openly" to this minister and even forewarned him of his death.

Like Moray, Kincardine, and Lauderdale, Edward Harley utilized invisible inks and complex codes when he corresponded with his intimates, and he seemed to share Masonic as well as military interests with his Scottish colleagues. When Moray sent Edward, his "noble friend," a remarkable account of his interior spiritual life, he signed it with his Mason's Mark.¹⁵⁷ Edward and his son Robert (later First Earl of Oxford) took a keen interest in Scottish affairs, and Robert *filis* would later be praised as an "honest Mason" by the Scottish Duke of Hamilton.¹⁵⁸ The great Harleian collection of manuscripts included seventeenth-century Masonic documents, and the family transmitted an important Masonic tradition into the milieu of Defoe and Swift in the eighteenth century.¹⁵⁹

Rutherford completed the evacuation of Dunkirk in spring 1663, when the king appointed him governor of Tangier. Now made Earl of Teviot, he called upon his friends Moray and Lauderdale to help persuade the king to give "a secret ordre for keiping up a Scots companie" for the new colony.¹⁶⁰ During Teviot's service with the Scots Guard, he developed a chivalric sense of diplomacy and warfare, which was now reinforced by James St. Clair, who accompanied him to Tangier. Teviot's knightly *virtù* earned the respect of his Moorish opponents, and he even befriended the fierce warrior Gailan, who despised the English troops but admired their Scottish governor.¹⁶¹ While planning the great Mole and Fort Charles, Teviot worked with St. Clair, the Tessins, and Martin Beckman (another Swedish military architect who had served in Edinburgh), and he

¹⁵⁶ J. Aubrey, *Miscellanies*, 164–67.

¹⁵⁷ British Library: Harley Papers. Add.MS.29/181.f.3, 15.

¹⁵⁸ Paula Backscheider, *Daniel Defoe: His Life* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1989), 214.

¹⁵⁹ On the Harleian Masonic MSS., see G.W. Speth, ed., *Masonic Reprints of the Lodge Quatuor Coronati*, #2076, London (1891), vols. II, III, i–vi.

¹⁶⁰ O. Airy, "Letters . . . Lauderdale," 28–30.

¹⁶¹ E. Routh, *Tangier*, 36–48.

gained their respect for his skill in designing and building stone fortifications.¹⁶² More importantly, he infused an optimistic and tolerant spirit among the racially and religiously diverse populace of the colony.

In September 1663 Teviot returned to England to report to the Tangier Commission on the progress of the colony. The foreign secretary Arlington approved of his tolerant policy, noting that Teviot has “made a new advantageous peace with Gayland.”¹⁶³ From London Teviot wrote to Lauderdale in Edinburgh with operative masonic news (“we built fiv redouts of stone and lyme”), adding that he kissed the hands of Moray and Charles II.¹⁶⁴ Teviot confided to Moray his experiences in Tangier and then travelled to York, where he called on Buckingham, who professed his support of Lauderdale against the earl’s “illwishers.” At this time, Buckingham was carrying on an ambitious architectural program, and he was probably eager to hear about the great Mole in Tangier. He also employed the Rosicrucian Heydon in his chemistry lab. From York Teviot travelled to Scotland, where he recruited five hundred soldiers and craftsmen for the colony. On 4 February 1664 in London, Evelyn hosted Teviot, Moray, Lauderdale, Brouncker, Wilkins, and Hooke, who urged Teviot to send scientific news from Tangier to the Royal Society.¹⁶⁵

After returning to the colony in February, Teviot continued to correspond with Moray and Lauderdale about the great masonic project of the Mole, while he successfully dealt with Jewish translators, Moslem traders, and a motley workforce drawn from Ireland, Scotland, England, Italy, and Portugal. The key to Teviot’s accomplishments was his trusting relationship with Solomon Pariente, known as “the Rich Jew,” who served as his chief interpreter and liaison with the various ethnic groups. Benady notes that Jewish religious life in Morocco “reflected the Sufi mysticism of the national back-

¹⁶² George, Lord Rutherford, *The Moors Baffled, being a Discourse concerning Tangier, especially while under the Government of that Renowned General, Andrew, Earl of Teviot*, 2nd ed. (1681; Edinburgh: Ruddiman, 1738), 6–10, 21–24.

¹⁶³ Henry Bennet, Earl of Arlington, *The Right Honourable Earl of Arlington’s Letters to Sir William Temple, Bar.*, ed. Thomas Babington (London: Thomas Bennett, 1701), 83. The editor misdates the letter to 1666, two years after Teviot’s death.

¹⁶⁴ O. Airy, “Letters . . . Lauderdale,” 29–31.

¹⁶⁵ J. Evelyn, *Diary*, IV, 369–70.

ground, by its devotion to the Kabbala."¹⁶⁶ As we shall see, a later Irish governor would protect certain Cabalistic Jews (former Marranos turned crypto-Sabbatians), when they were excommunicated by orthodox rabbis.

Given the Scottish Freemasons' current interest in Hebrew lore, the question arises of whether their brothers in the colony learned about the pioneering role that Jewish masons played in Tangier in the Middle Ages. Manuscripts of Al-Bakri's description of Moroccan masonry as an exclusively Jewish occupation were currently preserved in Spanish, Dutch, and British libraries. Moreover, there was a substantial population of Jews with centuries-long family histories in Tangier. Teviot's friendship with these Jews and his tolerant policies evoked praise from a Scottish resident, who reported his "singular carefulness to carry an equal hand in all controversies that happened betwixt the Christians and Jews," because "both by Nature and Religion, he was inclined to impartial Justice."¹⁶⁷ Unfortunately, in May 1664 Teviot was killed in a skirmish with the Moors that took place on the "Jews' Mount," which was subsequently renamed "Teviot's Hill."

After his patron's death, St. Clair returned from Tangier to Scotland, where he undertook ambitious and innovative architectural projects, including some with Sir William Bruce who, according to Anderson, now served as Grand Master in the north.¹⁶⁸ Charles II was greatly afflicted by Teviot's death, and he determined—in the face of parliamentary opposition—to continue the policy of religious toleration and masonic support for the colony. New shipments of operative masons were sent out, and royal orders allowed the building and maintenance of a synagogue as well as Catholic chapels for the Portuguese population. The governors continued to use Jewish intermediaries to negotiate peace terms with Gailan and other Moslems.¹⁶⁹ In 1666–68 the Rosicrucian chaplain Tonge was sent to Tangier, which now received Protestant Dissenters as well as Catholics.

The hitherto puzzling emergence in the eighteenth century of

¹⁶⁶ T.M. Benady, "The Role of Jews in the British Colonies of the Western Mediterranean," *TJHSE*, 33 (1992), 47, 60–61.

¹⁶⁷ L. Rutherford, *Moors Baffled*, 18–19; also, "Jews in Tangiers under Lord Teviot's Regime," *TJHSE*, 4 (1901), 201.

¹⁶⁸ On St. Clair and Bruce, see R. Hay, *Genealogie*, 168.

¹⁶⁹ F. Routledge, *Calendar . . . Clarendon*, V, 599.

Scottish-rite, *Rose-Croix* Masonic enclaves maintained by Cabalistic Jews in North Africa may have had roots in the tenures of Teviot, St. Clair, Tessin, and Tonge in the colony.¹⁷⁰ Over the next two decades, the king's policy of religious liberty and his support for Scottish, Irish, and Yorkshire colonists earned their staunch loyalty to the royalist cause—and increasing parliamentary fear that these seasoned troops posed a Papist threat to England. One of the major informers about such threats would be Tonge, whose lurid charges were fueled by his experiences in the religiously eclectic colony.

During the period of Moray's close contact with the Harleys and Wren, he took a keen interest in building operations in London, while he helped Kincardine supply stones to English craftsmen. For several years, Moray worked on a "History of Masonry" for the Royal Society.¹⁷¹ From his letters to Oldenburg, it is clear that he concentrated on operative masonry and hoped to make extensive studies in foreign literature as well as "ocular inspection & experiment."¹⁷² Given his many public responsibilities, Moray lamented his lack of time, and he hoped to stimulate other researchers on the subject. Noting that "I mean to expatiate now & then a little out of the path of my task," he perhaps intended to reveal some of the esoteric traditions of the Scottish craft. Though the historian of the Royal Society, Thomas Sprat, implied that Moray turned in the work, it has never been located.¹⁷³ As we shall see, it may have ended up among Robert Hooke's papers.

In Moray's surviving correspondence with Lauderdale, there are suggestions of their continuing usage of Freemasonry—both philosophically and politically—in their consultations with Charles II concerning Scottish affairs. When Lauderdale was in Scotland, he made Moray his deputy in London, and he gave his friend access to his "little closet at Whitehall," where he kept his most precious books and manuscripts. Among these was his "little octavo Hebrew Bible without points," which he asked Moray to send to him.¹⁷⁴ Charles

¹⁷⁰ On a Jewish-Rosicrucian-Masonic society in Algiers in 1782, see Gordon P. Hills, "Notes on the Rainsford Papers in the British Museum," *AQC*, 26 (1913), 93–129.

¹⁷¹ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 177.

¹⁷² H. Oldenburg, *Correspondence*, II, 507.

¹⁷³ A. Robertson, *Moray*, 165.

¹⁷⁴ Lord Alexander Lindsay, *A Memoir of Lady Anna Mackenzie* (Edinburgh: Edmonton and Douglas, 1868).

II was also collecting Hebrew books, which would later be donated by Solomon da Costa, descendant of royalist Jews, to the new British Museum.¹⁷⁵ The king also shared the Scots' interests in mystical and practical alchemy, and Moray often used the chemistry lab at Whitehall to hold secret conversations with him.

Apparently with the king's connivance, the Scottish courtiers stayed aloof from English political affairs, while they were given a free hand to run Scotland. Moreover, Charles seemed to maintain a special Masonic bond with his Scottish brothers. In addition to Lauderdale, Moray, and Kincardine, he utilized William Bruce, Gilbert Burnet, John Leslie (Sixth Earl of Rothes), and Charles Seton (Second Earl of Dunfermline and son of William Schaw's friend, the First Earl). Moray and Lauderdale also relied upon the Earl of Lothian, who had great influence with Covenanters but was still slightly suspect to royalists in England.¹⁷⁶ All of these men had Masonic connections. In their struggle to displace the corrupt, "Drunken Regime" of their former friend, the Earl of Middleton, this network took "an oathe of secrecie" in 1663.

At this time, John Mylne and William Bruce were working on plans for the reconstruction of Holyrood Palace, and they both contributed to a royalist architectural revival in the north. In order to bolster Mylne's power, Charles confirmed his position as royal master mason in December 1664. The Charter issued by the king made clear the wide provenance of Freemasonry, for it included jurisdiction over all royal building projects as well as fortification, gunnery, and other "artificers belonging to the ordinance."¹⁷⁷ Mylne was assisted by William Bruce, who participated in Moray's oath-bound network. As a "gentleman architect," who studied Jones's buildings in England as well as works in Holland and France, Bruce developed into the most important designer in Scotland over the next decades. Though he was well versed in operative masonry, he acted more as a "modern" supervisor of projects than as a guild-trained master mason.¹⁷⁸ At the same time, his master mason Mylne earned the high social prestige and position of an architect because of the skill of his operative work.

¹⁷⁵ D. Katz, *Jews in England*, 371–72.

¹⁷⁶ D. Stevenson, *First Freemasons*, 138; R. Kerr, *Correspondence*, II, 431–38, 450, 461; O. Airy, *Lauderdale Papers*, I, 138, 142, 144, 148, 156, 171, 175, 191, 279.

¹⁷⁷ R. Mylne, *Master Masons*, 147.

¹⁷⁸ M. Glendinning, *History*, 74.

Given their determination to keep Scottish affairs beyond the interference of the English Parliament, the question arises of whether Moray and his colleagues were willing to share Scottish Masonic secrets with their English brethren. The whole concept of an elite group of “accepted” Masons, which developed earlier under Inigo Jones, may have provided for a secretive inner circle of royalist Masons, who did not share the traditional antagonisms between Scotland and England. Besides the friendship of Moray with Evelyn, Wren, Ashmole, and the Harleys, there were other indications of English access to Scottish “speculative” traditions. Like Moray, who was frustrated by the negligence of Denham, the king realised that the Master of Works was inadequate for his ambitious architectural projects.

In 1663 Charles recalled John Webb, who was ordered to assist Denham in the reconstruction of Greenwich Palace. While Webb was “given equal executive powers with the titular chief of the works,” he also resumed his theatrical activities, in which he exploited his earlier training with Inigo Jones.¹⁷⁹ As he later boasted, he would “initiate others in the mysteries of the Scenical Art, which to others than himself was before much unknown.”¹⁸⁰ In the scenic designs that Webb produced for private, public, and courtly theaters, many themes of symbolic and chivalric Masonry were introduced—themes that would later emerge in the secret ceremonies of eighteenth-century lodges organized by Jacobite exiles.

During the Interregnum, Webb had been employed by William Davenant to produce designs for *The Siege of Rhodes*, which Davenant composed in operatic form in order to circumvent the ban on theatrical performances. Presented to small private audiences at Rutland House in 1656, the play reflected the Stuarts’ admiration for the Knights Hospitallers and their unified Christian crusade against the Turks. Webb studied cartographical descriptions of Rhodes and its architecture in order to accurately portray the Grand Master’s palace and St. George’s Tower, as well as the Turks’ military encampments. When registering his work, Davenant called it a masque, but he avoided that prohibited term on the titlepage. Though Davenant suggested parallels between the embattled Rhodians and Charles I’s

¹⁷⁹ William G. Keith, “John Webb and the Court Theatre of Charles II, *Architectural Review*, 57 (1925), 49.

¹⁸⁰ H. Colvin, *Biog. Dict.*, 1028.

party in England, the original version did not elaborate its Stuart themes. However, after the Restoration, Davenant revised the work and developed the theme of conjugal love between Alphonso and Ianthe to celebrate the loyalty and affection maintained by Charles I and Henrietta Maria.

In the 1663 text, dedicated to Clarendon, Davenant stressed the theme of pacific chivalry championed by James I and Charles I in their revitalization of the Order of the Garter. Noting that "my Rhodians seem to enjoy a better Harbour in the pacifique Thames, than they had on the Mediterranean," he praised the Knights of Rhodes as the "only fortify'd academy in Christendom where Divinity and Arms were equally profess'd."¹⁸¹ Referring obliquely to the Templar-Hospitaller red cross worn on the knights' habits, a Turkish character observes that "their Cross is bloody, and they come to bleed." Davenant drew on his earlier service to the exiled court to remind his audience of Henrietta Maria's heroism and generosity when she sold her jewels in Holland to buy arms for her husband. While his knights unsuccessfully solicit assistance from various Christian monarchs, he reminded them of the shameful compliance with Cromwell enacted by several European kings. Villerius, the heroic French Grand Master of the knights, had been trained in "Honours School," where religious sectarianism and political opportunism were not allowed. Even Solyman, the honorable Turk, adhered more to honor than the disputatious Christians.

As Solyman, the "Christian Turk," erects a palace outside the besieged city, Webb utilized his own architectural and masonic experience to scenically depict "Artificers appearing at work about that Castle which was there, with wonderful expedition, erected by Solyman." Stonemasons from Grecian quarries and pioneers from Lycia are set to work by the Turks, while the knights meet at the Grand Master's palace to plan their defense. In a striking masonic image, Villerius argues the necessity of unity to their cause:

Pow'r is an Arch which ev'ry common hand
Does help to raise to a magnifque height;
And it requites their aid when it does stand
With firmer strength beneath increasing weight.¹⁸²

¹⁸¹ William Davenant, *The Siege of Rhodes*, ed. Ann-Mari Hedbok (Uppsala: Rotobekman, 1973), 5-6, 89.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, 59; also, 28.

The success of *The Siege of Rhodes* led to Webb's production of more oriental and chivalric dramas, in which the illuminated knights espouse the glories of royalist architecture.

In 1665, when the Royal Society ceased meeting because of the plague, Christopher Wren travelled to Paris to study the ambitious architectural projects implemented by Louis XIV. He met Bernini, Mansart, and other famous designers, but he was most impressed by the organization and expertise of the French masons. At the Louvre, he observed huge teams of masons with their advanced machines, and he praised them as a virtual "School of Architecture," the best in Europe.¹⁸³ His admiration was shared by the Earl of St. Albans, who hosted Wren and accompanied him around the city. As noted earlier, Moray may have been instrumental in St. Albans's association with Masonry, and the earl allegedly served as Grand Master of England.¹⁸⁴

While Wren was abroad, Charles II, Moray, and the court moved to Oxford. With royal building projects at a standstill, Moray tried to finish his "History of Masonry." Thus, Wren's reports on Parisian masonry would be relevant to his on-going research on the subject. At the same time, Moray pursued Rosicrucian studies and experiments with Thomas Vaughan, who accompanied him to Oxford. It was during this year that Charles II's recognition of Moray's singular spiritual beliefs was recorded by the Earl of Rothes. Reflecting on Moray's refusal to commit himself exclusively to any one church or sect, while maintaining a deeply religious mentality, the king commented, "I believe he is head of his own church."¹⁸⁵ Moray himself noted that "I have also been reported to be writing against Scriptur, an Atheist, a Magician or Necromancer, and a Malignant."

In order to carry out the king's commission for his chemical work, Vaughan remained in Oxford when Moray returned to London. On 14 March 1666 the Royal Society met for the first time since the plague break, and Moray reported on his work with Vaughan, noting that Vaughan agreed with Baptista Porta's use of "sublimate" to harden iron tools.¹⁸⁶ This technique was relevant to the current efforts

¹⁸³ C. Wren, *Parentalia*, 261.

¹⁸⁴ J. Anderson, *Constitutions* (1738), 101.

¹⁸⁵ D. Stevenson, "Masonry," 426, 429n.13.

¹⁸⁶ For the following reports, see T. Birch, *History*, I, 68, 73, 113, 109, 116.

of Moray and Kincardine to develop improved methods of cutting marble and hewing stone. Another Fellow reported that Edmund Dickinson, a court alchemist, was experimenting on toads. At a meeting on 29 April, they witnessed a display of white powder that was said to produce transmuted gold. While the society listened to various Rosicrucian-style reports, the Fellows pressed Moray to "give in his full history of masonry, which he still declined to do, alledging it to be incomplete." On 15 August he was further urged to "perfect" his history, which seemed increasingly relevant because the society hoped to have an influence on the rebuilding of London.

Moray's apparent reluctance to reveal Masonic secrets was perhaps prompted by the current attacks on Rosicrucianism and certain royalist building projects. Moreover, the most serious criticism of Rosicrucianism came from within the Royal Society. In June 1666 Samuel Parker, a radical Puritan before and radical Anglican after the Restoration, was made a Fellow.¹⁸⁷ He then published a blistering criticism of Vaughan, Heydon and their "sect of Rosicrucians." In *A Free and Impartial Censure of the Platonike Philosophie* (1666), Parker attacked the whole Platonic, Pythagorean, and Hermetic tradition, while demanding experimental proof and evidence for its claims. Burnet noted that Parker's most "virulent" assault was targeted at current Rosicrucians and Jews, whom he linked with potential sedition: "I may dare to add the same censure to our late English Rosie-Crucians," but "I have been scared from engaging a Rosie-Crucian, ever since I first saw the controversial Rencountre of Eugenius Philalethes [Thomas Vaughan]." Even worse was "the venerable author of the Heydonian Philosophy, as himself styles his own ignorant, uncouth, and ridiculous scribble":

They directly Poison men's minds, and dispose them to the wildest and most Enthusiasticke Fanaticisme; for there is so much affinity between Rosi-Crucianisme and Enthusiasme, that whosoever entertains the one, he may upon the same Reason embrace the other.¹⁸⁸

In 1667, in a revised second edition, Parker claimed that the Rosicrucians "tell us of strange Books, Monuments, Inscriptions found in China, Japan, and Tartarie, because in such stories they are secure

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., II, 96.

¹⁸⁸ Samuel Parker, *A Free and Impartial Censure of the Platonick Philosophie* (Oxford: W. Hall, 1666), 71.

from all contradiction.”¹⁸⁹ All of this nonsense should be scorned unless they can produce proof. Parker rejected as fables the books of Hermes Trismegistus and oracles of Zoroaster and then lambasted Jewish Cabalists and Christian Cabalists like Kircher:

As to the pretence of a Vocal Cabala, I can scarce without amazement consider with what confidence and eagerness some learned men of late have cryed up an invention so novel and fanciful; for I know of nothing more precarious and destitute of tolerable pretences then these Cabalistical Traditions, being only a late and silly invention of the Jewish Rabbins . . . and yet Kircher (who never gives out at credulity) would have everyone that does not believe the Divine Original of the Cabala to be convicted of Heresie as an Enemy to Divine Providence. But, for my part, I cannot understand how any Rational man can be at all concerned for so vain and frivolous an Invention of the Modern (i.e., trifling) Rabbins. But he that could find all the Learning of the world in an Egyptian hieroglyphick may find all the Articles of his faith in a Rabbinical Fable . . .¹⁹⁰

Condemning contemporary Jews for their “obstinate adherence to the Mosaick Law,” Parker then mocked contemporary Christians who take them seriously:

They who are acquainted with Customes and Tenets of the Modern Jewes, know what pretty analogies they fetch from Scripture, to abet their fond and ridiculous usages, indeed their prettinesse is so odde and surprising, that were it in any other matter, they would be as delightful as impertinent.¹⁹¹

The worst books, with the most copious accounts of these absurdities, are Reuchlin’s *de Arte Cabalistica* and Kircher’s *Oedipus*. For Moray, who had recommended these books to his Masonic friends, Parker’s attack must have been disturbing. Vaughan, his protégé, was currently carrying out Rosicrucian experiments for the king and, through his friendship with Buckingham, he was probably aware of Heydon’s Rosicrucian projects. Moreover, Heydon had recently tried to mend relations with Vaughan.

When Heydon defended himself in *Sorex primus* and *Sorex secundus* (1666), vindications “of the Rosicrucian philosophy against Samuel Parker and other adversaries,” these works and other Rosicrucian

¹⁸⁹ (1667), *ibid.*, 223.

¹⁹⁰ (1666), *ibid.*, 104–05.

¹⁹¹ (1667), *ibid.*, 226.

manuscripts were confiscated by parliamentary officials.¹⁹² Among Heydon's papers were appeals to Richard Brooke, one of Monk's gentlemen, and to Buckingham for assistance against his persecutors. Heydon was accused of association with a radical Quaker, who "spoke against the Duke of Albermarle [Monk], and pointing to St. Paul's Cathedral, said the whore's cap is off." Heydon hoped that one manuscript, "A field of virtue, freely given to his friend, by George, the second Duke of Buckingham," would help his cause, because it railed "against the sanctimonious hypocrisy of Cromwell, lauding the virtuous conduct of Charles II rather than his warlike acts, representing justice as the field of virtue, etc." As events proved, the attacks on Heydon were motivated by Clarendon's hostility to Buckingham.

Within two days in early 1667, Rosicrucianism was dealt two severe blows. On 26 February an order was issued for the arrest of Buckingham on charges that he collaborated with Heydon in casting the king's nativity and uttering seditious comments against the government.¹⁹³ On 27 February Thomas Vaughan died from mercury poisoning while performing chemical experiments for the king. According to Henry Vaughan, he was buried by Sir Robert Moray, "his great friend (and then Secretary of Estate for the Kingdom of Scotland) to whom he gave his bookes and MSS."¹⁹⁴ Moray was probably aware that the charges against Heydon and Buckingham were engineered by the despised Clarendon, who had earlier accused him of sorcery and who attempted to subvert his and Lauderdale's policies in Scotland. Though Heydon was tortured, he refused to implicate Buckingham, who went into hiding for four months in Yorkshire.

These assaults on Rosicrucianism were compounded by more attacks on the king's masonic projects. In February 1666 his Master of Works, John Denham, became insane while on his way to "the famous free-stone quarries at Portland."¹⁹⁵ Rumors swirled that his illness was brought on by his own sexual excesses and jealousy about his wife's affair with the king's brother James. While Moray's Masonic colleague Dr. Fraser attended Denham, Buckingham's protégé Hugh

¹⁹² CSP. Domestic. Charles II. 1666, VI, 429-31.

¹⁹³ C. Phipps, *Buckingham*, 13.

¹⁹⁴ J. Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, 304.

¹⁹⁵ J. Denham, *Works*, 21-22.

May took over Denham's responsibilities, which fueled new rumors about Buckingham's overweening ambitions. When Denham seemed to recover, Buckingham's collaborator Samuel Butler issued a satirical attack on the Master of Works. In "A Panegyric Upon Sir John Denham's Recovery from Madness," he sardonically painted a picture of masonic incompetence and corruption, in which the royal Surveyor cheated not only his workmen but the king.¹⁹⁶

In the midst of these widely publicized scandals, a new Grand Master—Thomas Savage, Earl of Rivers—was named to replace St. Albans on 24 June.¹⁹⁷ As a well-known miser, Rivers was an appropriate choice to reform Denham's extravagant practices. But, as a Catholic, he was a controversial appointment, who would intensify Protestant suspicions about the king's masonic endeavors. According to Anderson, Rivers then appointed Wren as his Deputy, with Webb and Grinling Gibbons as Grand Wardens; hinting at Rivers's ineffectiveness, he added that "the Deputy and Wardens manag'd all things."

On 27 August 1666 Evelyn described the surveying work he undertook with Wren, May, Pratt, and other interested parties to determine the repairs that would be necessary for St. Paul's.¹⁹⁸ The group agreed on an ambitious design and planned to nominate a committee of able workmen to examine the present foundation. However, on 2 September a great fire swept through London, provoking Evelyn to lament: "London was, but is no more!" By 13 September, Evelyn was able to present to Charles a survey of the ruins and a plot for a new city. The Royal Society took a keen interest in projects for rebuilding London, and Hooke and Petty presented plans in addition to Evelyn's. Oldenburg hoped that public identification of the Fellows with this architectural project would avail "not a little to silence those, who aske continually, What have they done?"¹⁹⁹ On 10 October the Lord Mayor ordered Hooke and Wren to make a complete survey for the reconstruction of the city.

Though Charles II conducted himself courageously and generously during the fire, the continuing levity of the court provoked criticism from Evelyn, who resented Webb's preoccupation with theatrical pur-

¹⁹⁶ S. Butler, *Satires*, 121.

¹⁹⁷ J. Anderson, *Constitutions* (1738), 102.

¹⁹⁸ J. Evelyn, *Diary*, III, 448–62.

¹⁹⁹ H. Oldenburg, *Correspondence*, III, 231.

suits "in a time of such judgments and calamities."²⁰⁰ Critics of the king's current ministers singled out Chancellor Clarendon for special abuse. The poet Andrew Marvell, who shared architectural and alchemical interests with Buckingham, penned a bitter poem on "Clarindon's House-Warming." Designed by Pratt and commenced in 1664, the great house consumed vast sums and almost bankrupted Clarendon. By 1665 critics called it "Dunkirk House," implying that he used profits from the unpopular sale of Dunkirk. During the war and plague year, over three hundred workmen were employed, and many citizens lamented that the house was not consumed by the great fire. Referring to three disasters (war, plague, and fire), Marvell accused Clarendon of stealing from the public to finance his private architectural folly:

When Clarindon had discern'd beforehand
 (As the cause can eas'ly foretell the effect)
 At once three deluges threat'ning our Land,
 'Twas the season, he thought, to turn architect.

.....
 The Scotch forts and Dunkirk, but that they were sold,
 He would have demolish'd to raise up his walls;
 Nay ev'n from Tangier have sent back for the mould [Mole],
 But that he had nearer the stones of St. Paul's.

.....
 By subsidies thus both clerick and laick,
 And with matter profane cemented with holy;
 He finish'd at last his palace mosaick,
 By a model more excellent than Lesly's folly.

.....
 This temple of War and of Peace is the shrine,
 Where this idol of state sits ador'd and accurst . . .²⁰¹

In his reference to the Scotch forts, Marvell pointed to Lauderdale's policy of demolishing Monk's forts of occupation and turning their sites into civilian productivity. Probably aware of Clarendon's hostility to Lauderdale, Marvell sympathized at this time with the Scot's pacifying policy. He was also aware of Scottish expertise in stone-building, for "Lesly's folly" was the fortified palace built by Bishop Leslie of Orkney, which was so strongly constructed that it long

²⁰⁰ J. Evelyn, *Diary*, III, 465-66.

²⁰¹ A. Marvell, *Poems*, I, 143.

resisted Cromwell's arms.²⁰² These brief allusions to Scottish masonic matters are suggestive, for Marvell would later publish the first reference by an Englishman to the "Mason Word."²⁰³

In Samuel Parker's attack upon "the sect of Heydonians," he demonstrated the "hatred of enthusiasm" and scorn for "the common and mechanical sort of man" that would later provoke Marvell to satirical counter-attack.²⁰⁴ Thus, Marvell must have been pleased when Buckingham was eventually able to expose Clarendon's instigation of the false charges against himself and Heydon, which was a factor in the downfall of the vastly unpopular chancellor. After a lengthy impeachment process, Clarendon was finally removed from office on 30 August, and the Great Seal passed to Henry Bennet, Lord Arlington, who had long worked cooperatively with Moray on Royal Society affairs and with Lauderdale on Scottish affairs.²⁰⁵ According to Anderson, Arlington later served as Grand Master of the Freemasons.²⁰⁶ After Clarendon's fall, Buckingham became the most powerful member of the Privy Council.²⁰⁷

Under a more sympathetic ministry, Lauderdale, Kincardine, and Moray hoped to moderate ecclesiastical policy in Scotland, where Anglican intrusions in Scottish church affairs were alienating many royalists. On 9 April 1666 Moray replied to a letter from Lothian, who protested the fines imposed upon him by the Bishop of St. Andrews for refusing to sign a declaration of Episcopalianism.²⁰⁸ Though Moray assured Lothian of his respect and friendship, he warned him that powerful Anglican officials looked upon it "as a readines, if not a design to subvert the government of Church and State." Nevertheless, "Earl Lauderdale intends to represent your condition to the King," which is "the highest testimony of kindness he can give you."

In a passionate and eloquent response, Lothian granted that Moray had "a more charitable opinion of very many that scruple att the

²⁰² Ibid., I, 340–45.

²⁰³ Published in 1673; see Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpos'd*, ed. D.I.B. Smith (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971), 35.

²⁰⁴ A. Marvell, *Poems*, I, xi.

²⁰⁵ T. Birch, *History*, I, 214, 435.

²⁰⁶ From 1679 to 1685; see Anderson, *Constitutions (1738)*, 105.

²⁰⁷ John O'Niell, *George Villiers, Second Duke of Buckingham* (Boston: Twayne, 1984), 8–9.

²⁰⁸ R. Kerr, *Correspondence*, II, 474–76.

Declaration," but a man is "low spirited that will be hyred to it, and be led after the chariott of some men's triumphs with the wretches hath subscrybed for money." Vowing his undying loyalty to Charles II, Lothian maintained the position of the original Covenanters that Scottish national rights transcended English religious policies. Though Moray and Lauderdale sympathized with the scruples of their old friend, they knew that his essentially moderate position was anathema to the more rigid Anglicans. Even worse, it would reinforce the anti-monarchical radicals in Scotland. Like the dissidents, Lothian was currently reading many polemical tracts against the alleged machinations of the Jesuits.²⁰⁹

By November 1666 the situation in Scotland had deteriorated so much that radical Presbyterians were able to foment the Pentland Rising. Royalists scorned the rebels as "Whigs," a Scottish vernacular term for "corrupt and sour Whey," and the sobriquet would take on increasingly potent political significance. In order to obtain an accurate report on conditions in the north, the king sent Moray on a secret mission to Edinburgh in June 1667. Taking a position on the Scottish Privy Council, Moray made clear to "the military party and the Episcopal clergy that their policy of violence must give place to a milder regime."²¹⁰ While in Scotland for twelve months, Moray carried on his Masonic correspondence with Lauderdale, who communicated the reports to Charles.

Moray utilized their old strategy of invisible inks and Masonic symbols: "Where you see my mason mark you will remember what it means [Viz., that writing follows in sympathetic ink]. I think I will play the mason in my next."²¹¹ He further advised, "Of all vitriols, the white is best for the eyes when you go a star shooting. It makes hid things visible, and leaves the ground still undisclosed." Moray was so concerned about the secrecy of his reports that he kept no copies of his letters and often relied on oral communications via trusted (initiated?) messengers: "Hereafter possibly by astronomical means, your eyes may inform you of some of them, or if not that, your ears." When relating intimate or sordid stories, he "reserved some for starlight." In a later conversation with the king,

²⁰⁹ Kerr's library: additions to catalogue made by Lothian from 1666 on.

²¹⁰ A. Robertson, *Moray*, 127.

²¹¹ For Moray's Masonic codes or "stargazing," see O. Airy, *Lauderdale Papers*, II, 15-16, 31, 36, 50; III, 145.

Moray described his cryptographic method as “my laudable custome of writing as dogs piss in the snow.”

At this time, Charles played an active role in plans to rebuild London, and Moray’s reports on architectural works in Scotland were relevant and timely. Besides his Masonic political codes, Moray wrote about practical masonic projects. He made critical inspections of Lauderdale’s Scottish residences, sketched designs for possible architectural changes, and sent technical advice on methods of cutting hard stone.²¹² Lauderdale, who “delighted in building” and took an interest in all construction details, made copies of architectural drawings to send to Moray and William Bruce in Scotland.²¹³ In one letter to Lauderdale, Moray made a light-hearted (and cryptic) reference to the Cabalistic significance of the Mason Word: “My last analyzed the Cabalistical word Brownley, which made us laugh as it will do you, but we keep it as much secret as the Masons do theirs.”²¹⁴ Could this be a coded reference to “S. Brownloe,” the Rosicrucian adept so “mightily hunted” by Thomas Vaughan in 1659?²¹⁵

Before leaving for Edinburgh, Moray had developed a confidential relationship with Archbishop Sheldon, who directed an ambitious program of church construction.²¹⁶ While Moray was in Scotland, he labored to support Sheldon in his attempts “to settle and secure Episcopacy” by implementing more moderate policies, for the previous militant approach “had almost unhinged the State.”²¹⁷ In Moray’s correspondence with Lauderdale, he discussed his collaboration with Sheldon, for whom he used the code name “my morall friend.”²¹⁸ In these discussions, Moray frequently employed his Mason’s Mark, indicating secret writing to follow. However, Moray may also have undertaken an actual Masonic relationship with Sheldon, as suggested by his letter to the archbishop on 14 October 1667.

Moray expressed his distaste for the public and political world and wished that he and Sheldon could retreat into the spiritual and moral sphere: “I take much more delight, as I think you do, in surveying

²¹² University of Edinburgh: MS.Dc.1.70.ff.83, 147, 188 (Moray’s letters to Lauderdale).

²¹³ J. Macaulay, *Classical Country House*, 13.

²¹⁴ University of Edinburgh: MS.Dc.1.70.f.151, f.151.

²¹⁵ D. Dickson, *Tessera*, 217, 230.

²¹⁶ Victor Sutch, *Gilbert Sheldon, Architect of Anglican Survival* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973), 148–54.

²¹⁷ O. Airy, *Lauderdale Papers*, II, 50.

²¹⁸ *Ibid.*, III, 76.

Cebes' lanskip, than Mercators Mapps."²¹⁹ Stevenson observes that "Mercator's maps of the physical world stand for involvement in worldly affairs, while the landscape of Cebes concerns spiritual realms."²²⁰ *The Tablature of Cebes*, popularly attributed to a pupil of Socrates, comprised an allegorical description of human life, in which initiates enter an architectural setting, composed of a series of enclosures and tableaux.²²¹ An old man explains that the temple had been consecrated by a wise stranger, "a zealous disciple of Pythagoras and Parmenides," and the explanation of the tablature is "like the riddle proposed by the sphinx." The initiates then climb a rocky path uphill to the Tree of Learning, which is represented by a middle-aged woman or Wisdom figure:

... the mother is placed on a square [pedestal] to signify the certainty and safety of the way that leads to her, and the unalterable and permanent nature both of the blessings she bestows and their happy effects ... [which] renders the possessors undisturbed by any of the accidents and calamities of life.²²²

The mother administers "this sovereign medicine which purges him of all evils he brought along with him" and then sends him to Happiness and Virtue. All these benefits flow from one truly divine principle, which cannot be named in words (a series of asterisks follows).

The spiritual pilgrimage through a temple, up a hill, to a vision of wisdom, and revelation of the missing word—described in the *Tablature of Cebes*—foreshadow in a rather startling way the Masonic rituals of enlightenment and regeneration that later emerged in *Écosais* lodges. That the "Mason King" James VI owned a copy of the work, at the time of his collaboration with William Schaw, was perhaps relevant.²²³ Moray drew his Mason's Mark on his letter to Sheldon, which suggests that he saw a resemblance between these rituals of mystical Pythagoreanism and those of Masonry. Thus, the emergence of the *Tablature of Cebes* in Masonic graphic art in the

²¹⁹ Bodleian Library, Dolben Papers: MS.Add.C.302. ff.79–80.

²²⁰ D. Stevenson, "Masonry," 427.

²²¹ *The Tablature of Cebes the Theban, a Disciple of Socrates, Being an Allegorical Picture of Human Life*, trans. Samuel Boyse. 3rd ed. (Glasgow: Robert and Andrew Foulis, 1750), 3–4.

²²² *Ibid.*, 23.

²²³ G. Warner, *Library of James VI*, xlv.

eighteenth century was probably rooted in these earlier developments.²²⁴

Moray further revealed to Sheldon the meditation and sublimation practices that allowed him to keep his spiritual integrity and emotional tranquility in the midst of corrupt, mercenary, and brutal public business:

You will easily believe it looks a little odd to me to see myself launched forth in a sea of business, after many years lying unrigged and moor'd out of the reach of active employment; yet let me tell you, tho' I have already a little taste of business, I do not find I grow at all more in love with it, or with any prospect it affords me than I would have been, when the impressions of those morals, that used to furnish us with discourse were most vigorous and freshest in my spirit . . . [but] my tranquillitie remains entire, and my spirit as unconcerned as it is wont, or rather . . . as it ought to be. The sublunary satisfactions that usually whet other men's endeavours to attain them, are still below my horizon. I look for none that are attainable, till what is mortal be swallowed up in immortality. I first adjust and blunt my appetites, the best I can, and then pinion them before I let them go; so that they fly but lamely at their objects, of which I always take such care beforehand that they be not within the sphere of forbidden things . . . And let my exercise [of political business] be all day what it will, the part of it, what only I reckon to be my own, and indeed is most savoury to me, is a few minutes alone before I go to bed . . . I may with a becoming boldness turn to my own bosom and entertain with a few short ejaculations the divine guest, that hath been long pressing for a temple to himself. And one of the most constant vehement importunities that I give him, is that it may be easie for me to slip into eternity in the midst of any action, my soul or its mortal tools are employed about.

Despite his elliptical language, it seems certain that Moray—like Thomas Vaughan—practised Cabalistic meditation in which he utilized magical calls (“ejaculations”) to evoke his angelic mentor. During his residence in Scotland, he was once again called “a Magician or Necromancer.”²²⁵

From Edinburgh Moray also corresponded with Edward Harley, whom he called “My noble friend.” On 18 November he sealed his letter with his Masonic pentacle which included the Greek letters for *AGAPE*. He also sent Harley a copy of his letter to Sheldon, sug-

²²⁴ Joy Macpherson, “‘Masonic Landscape Design,’ or Down the Garden Path,” *AQC*, 110 (1997), 58.

²²⁵ D. Stevenson, “Masonry,” 426.

gesting that Harley shared his Masonic philosophy.²²⁶ To both friends, he insisted that it is better to morally regenerate men than to probe into their faults and punish their misdeeds: "It is my study not so much to know how errors crept in, as how to screw them out. And I am as willing, tho' it be always not so easy, that the men be mended as the faults they have made."²²⁷ In the next century, *Ecossais* lodge rituals would aim at just such examination and reformation of initiates.

In the meantime, the king—who counted on Moray to implement Sheldon's current policy of moderate Episcopalianism in Scotland—participated in a significant masonic ceremony in London. On 23 October 1667 Charles "laid the first stone of the first pillar of the new building of the Exchange." According to Samuel Pepys, who was unable to pass through the shut gates, "a shed was set up and hung with tapestry, and a canopy of state, and some good victuals and wine, for the King, who it seems, did it."²²⁸ The account in Rugge's *Diurnal* notes that "His Majesty, with the usual ceremonies, placed the first stone" and assisted "at the solemnity." Elias Ashmole, a Freemason, and Edward Bernard, a Hebraist and astronomer, produced horoscopes for the affair, which indicated the most propitious time for the ceremony. From their notes, it is clear that the ceremony took forty-two minutes. Conder, an expert on seventeenth-century operative masonry, argues that the king followed the ancient Gothic tradition which drew on Jewish precedents: "Hebrew tradition has wrapped the stone of foundation with numerous legends, and the Christian church has always attached the greatest importance to it from the symbolic point of view."

Conder then describes the medieval Catholic ritual, which required that the stone be lowered into position and fixed, "the Master Mason in attendance to square and try the stone with square level and plumb, in order to demonstrate to all present that the cube is a perfect ashlar." From the surviving descriptions of Charles's actions, it seems that "he squared and tried the stone as a Master Mason would have had to do for the prelate who in the days long gone by officiated in the character of priest only." Conder, who was not aware that

²²⁶ British Library: Harley Papers. Add.MSS.29/179.f.308; 181.f.15.

²²⁷ Bodleian: Dolben MS.Add.C.302.ff.79–80.

²²⁸ Edward Conder, "King Charles II. at the Royal Exchange in London, in 1662," *AQC*, 11 (1898), 138–45.

the current Grand Master Rivers was a Catholic, suggests that the craftsmen preserved a dim memory of the older traditions, which somehow survived the suppressions of iconoclastic Reformers. It is possible that concerns about charges of Papism led to the closing of the gates, which prevented Pepys from witnessing the ceremony. The mallet that Charles used for a similar ceremony at St. Paul's in 1673 was presented to the "Old Lodge of St. Paul's, now the Lodge of Antiquity," in 1823.²²⁹

From Edinburgh Moray also corresponded with Evelyn, and both men used their Mason's Marks as signs of bonded friendship. On 14 January 1668, in reply to a letter (now lost) from Evelyn, Moray wrote: "By what Telescope you read me at this distance, I do not know. It seems you conclude me to be a greater Master in another sort of philosophy than that which is the business of the Royall Society."²³⁰ Moray pretended surprise that Evelyn could read his "most illegible parts," suggesting the latter's increasing capacity to understand Moray's Masonic codes and philosophy. At this time, Evelyn was performing alchemical experiments and may have hinted at Moray's rumored Rosicrucian expertise.

While Moray carried out extremely secretive missions for Lauderdale, the latter evidently initiated certain collaborators in London into Masonry. On 3 March 1668 Lauderdale wrote Moray to acknowledge the receipt of "your Mr. Mason from Jack as yow desired it."²³¹ From Moray's earlier correspondence with Alexander Bruce, where he used the term "Mr. Mason" to mean "Master Mason," it is clear that he used Lauderdale's servant Jack Kirkwood to transport a certificate or rituals of the Master Mason's degree.²³² Could Lauderdale have intended it for Archbishop Sheldon, for Lauderdale was then conferring with Moray's "morall freind" on their strategies for religious peace in Scotland. Moray had earlier confided his Masonic philosophy to Sheldon; perhaps he now hoped to raise him to a higher degree in the fraternity.

In July 1668, when Moray travelled to London, his friends in Scotland were anxious to secure his return. However, he wanted to

²²⁹ See Kerry Downes, "Sir Christopher Wren, Edward Woodroffe, J.H. Mansart, and Architectural History," *AH*, 37 (1994), 63, on "the historic Wren maul" used by Charles II in 1673.

²³⁰ D. Stevenson, "Masonry," 418.

²³¹ See H. Paton, "Letters from . . . Lauderdale," 154–57, 167.

²³² Kincardine MS.5050.ff.3–7; previously discussed in Chapter Eight.

devote his time to chemistry and to the cure of his seriously ill niece Sophia Lindsay, whom he brought south. By November Lauderdale informed their friends in Scotland that Moray would not leave London, because "his delight his heart is heir," and "he spends at least 9 houres each day in the Laboratorie." As a member of the Balcarres family, Sophia ("his delight") shared Moray's interests in Hermetic philosophy. Perhaps he hoped to effect a Rosicrucian cure through their mutual studies. Over the next ten months, his devotion to her gave rise to scandalous charges that he was secretly married, and a distressed Sophia had to be sent back to Scotland (at Charles II's expense).²³³

This curious affair perhaps explains Lauderdale's cryptic letter in which he discusses the necessity of a "reall separation" and "pressing MR [Moray] his going to Scotland." He concluded that "the young Ladies journey hither was a signall folie; waters were pretended but no such thing done, and the shorter follies be it is the better."²³⁴ The seeds of Moray's later estrangement from Lauderdale may have been planted in this hushed-up relationship. In an angry letter to Kincardine, Moray denied indignantly that he would ever marry again. He had earlier designed Masonic seals which featured the altar of love, on which his Masonic star pointed to his late wife as his "one alone."²³⁵ Always loyal to her memory, he had avoided carnal relationships with women. However, he attempted some kind of mystical friendship with Sophia. As we shall see, Moray's ill-fated experiment would later be replicated by John Evelyn with another spiritually-minded young woman.

Determined to retreat from political affairs, in which religious disputes were becoming increasingly fractious, Moray resumed his role as the most active member and "soul" of the Royal Society and as the king's resident chemist. On 4 November 1668 he wrote Kincardine that he has just placed in the royal laboratory a furnace made with his friend's stone, "as the best to endure fire, and the King was told so."²³⁶ While he labored to convince the increasingly incompetent Denham to utilize Kincardine's stone, he also pressured the Edinburgh provost Robert Mylne to help Kincardine coordinate his trade efforts

²³³ Ibid., f.159.

²³⁴ H. Paton, "Letters from . . . Lauderdale," 134.

²³⁵ D. Stevenson, "Masonry," 423.

²³⁶ Kincardine MS.5050. ff.150-52.

with Sir William Davidson in Holland. These efforts to revive the Scottish-Jewish mercantile dreams of the early 1660's were currently frustrated by English parliamentary opposition. In December Lauderdale lamented that Davidson's requests for "bygones" (reimbursements) would seem unreasonable to Parliament, "but he hath served the King so well & suffered so much for him without recompense, that I am sure his Majestie will order it."²³⁷

In 1669 Moray's interest in the Eastern-Jewish origins of Freemasonry received reinforcement from Wren, who undertook a survey of Salisbury Cathedral. From his study of the techniques of the Gothic masons, as preserved in the surviving structure and medieval documents, Wren concluded that the architectural design and technology were invented in the East, developed by the Saracens, and carried to the West by the Crusaders. In Europe this "Fraternity of Architects" styled themselves "Freemasons" and "ranged from one Nation to Another."²³⁸ Despite his own preference for Vitruvian classicism, Wren praised the Gothic masons for their economy and expertise in erecting "such lofty structures." Aubrey, who also admired the Gothic "Masons," recorded his conversation with Wren and Dugdale about the "Fraternity of Architects or Free-Masons," who were given a license by the Pope (in Henry III's time) for the building of churches."²³⁹ He further noted that "This Fraternity continues to this Day, and Elias Ashmole, Esq. told me that they have several lodges in several counties for their receptions."

Wren probably discussed his Masonic theories with Moray, his close friend, who longed to see Wren's career advance. On 9 March 1669 Moray wrote hopefully to Bruce:

Mill [Mylne] and I talk also of your stone, whereof he shew me your papers. Dr. Wren is now S.J. Denham's Deputy and I am therefore more hopeful than ever that some considerable bargain may be made with the King, or for the building of St. Pauls for your stone, if he can afford a price that will make you a reasonable gainer, for he likes your stone well.²⁴⁰

²³⁷ H. Paton, "Letters from . . . Lauderdale," 181. On Davidson's intelligence and political work for Charles II in 1665-68, see W. Seters, "Leeuwenhoek," 39-41.

²³⁸ C. Wren, *Parentalia*, 303-08.

²³⁹ Bodleian: MS.Top.Gen.c.25.ff.153. John Aubrey, "Chronologia Architectonica" (1671-?).

²⁴⁰ Kincardine MS.5050.f.153.

Constantly annoyed by obstacles imposed by English merchants, Moray urged Kincardine to work with his cousin, Sir William Bruce, while he continued to court the support of Wren. Finally, on 21 May 1669 Pepys recorded the death of Denham and the planned appointment of Wren as Surveyor of the King's Works.²⁴¹

On 9 July Wren joined Sheldon for a public masonic ceremony at Oxford. According to Anderson,

Gilbert Sheldon, Archbishop of Canterbury, an excellent Architect, shew'd his great Skill in designing his famous Theatrum Sheldonianum at Oxford, and at his Cost it was conducted and finish'd by Deputy Webb and Grand Warden Wren; and the Craftsmen having celebrated the Cape-Stone, it was open'd with an elegant oration.²⁴²

Pleased by these developments, Moray wrote Kincardine on 16 July a long letter about building stones, noting that "if the King's Master Mason speak to me of the stone, I will see to get him to go as high as I can." This progress in Moray's operative masonic projects was reinforced by apparent progress in his speculative Masonic policies—that, is the implementation of moderation and toleration in Scottish religious affairs.

He concluded the letter to Kincardine by noting that a proclamation will be issued in London against conventicles—the field meetings of armed and militant Covenanters—but "there will be a word to signfy the King's averseness from troubling folk for religion, etc."²⁴³ By September 1670 Moray was pleased to hear that Gilbert Burnet was preaching to the disaffected in Scotland and reclaiming them for the king's policy. As he consulted with William Bruce on plans for architectural renewal, Moray believed that the rebuilding of Jerusalem was well underway in the north.²⁴⁴ At the same time in the south, plans were underway for the rebuilding of St. Paul's—hopefully with Kincardine's Scottish stone. With his two friends Wren and Sheldon supporting the Royal Society and masonic programs, Moray sensed that "Solomon's House" would no longer be a "castle in the air."

During the last three years of Moray's life, he encouraged the international outreach of the Royal Society, especially to Sweden

²⁴¹ S. Pepys, *Diary*, IX, 491.

²⁴² J. Anderson, *Constitutions* (1738), 103.

²⁴³ Kincardine MS.5050.f.155.

²⁴⁴ H. Paton, "Letters from . . . Lauderdale," 233, 236.

where disciples of Thomas Vaughan and Bengt Skytte carried on the Rosicrucian Enlightenment.²⁴⁵ Seaton argues that contact with Scandinavian pansophists strengthened the belief in alchemy and Rosicrucianism maintained by many Fellows in England.²⁴⁶ Swedish visitors to London reported that Skytte's ideas were still influential and that he continued to make an impact on virtuosos in Europe. The German philosopher Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz met Skytte after he left London, and he was greatly impressed by the Swede's vision of a "Temple of Knowledge" with a "transreligious charter" and an "all encompassing conception of a secular ideal."²⁴⁷ Skytte's descriptions of his experiences in London further spurred Leibniz's interests in the goals and organization of the Royal Society.

In 1671 Leibniz was introduced to Francis Mercurius van Helmont, son of the famous Paracelsan physician, by Knorr von Rosenroth, an erudite Hebraist who was collecting Cabalistic writings for eventual translation and publication.²⁴⁸ Already an admirer of Van Helmont's Hermetic works, Leibniz was intrigued by the adventures and sufferings of the eccentric polymath. While in Rome in 1662, Van Helmont was imprisoned by the Inquisition and charged with Judaizing and Rosicrucian sedition. In their report, the Inquisitors claimed that he lived among Jews and was circumcised; even worse, he seduced the Catholic Duke of Sulzbach to join him in a search for "the brothers of the Rosy Cross, men whose reputes have been defamed he says."²⁴⁹ Leibniz developed a lifelong friendship with Van Helmont, whom he believed was a Rosicrucian.

In 1672, while in Paris, Leibniz became the confidential collaborator of the Huygenses, who reinforced his interest in Rosicrucianism while stretching his mathematical skills.²⁵⁰ From these contacts, Leibniz developed a preconception of the Royal Society as an essentially Rosicrucian fraternity with strong royal support. Armed with introductions from the Huygenses, Leibniz arrived in London in January

²⁴⁵ For Moray's Swedish contacts, see T. Birch, *History*, II, 400–01, 431–32, 450, 491, etc.

²⁴⁶ E. Seaton, *Literary Relations*, 293.

²⁴⁷ S. Akerman, *Christina*, 129.

²⁴⁸ Allison Coudert, *Leibniz and the Kabbalah* (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1995), 4–5.

²⁴⁹ Allison Coudert, *The Impact of the Kabbalah in the Seventeenth Century: The Life and Thought of Francis Mercury van Helmont* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 21, 352–59.

²⁵⁰ See M.K. Schuchard, "Leibniz, Benzeliuz, and Swedenborg: The Kabbalistic Roots of Swedish Illuminism," in Allison Coudert and Gordon Wiener, eds., *Leibniz, Mysticism, and Religion* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1998), 84–106.

1673, where he was warmly welcomed by Moray and Oldenburg—despite a chilly reception from Hooke and the more insular Fellows. Moray introduced Leibniz to interested members, arranged for the demonstration of his calculating machine, and showed him the chemical/alchemical laboratory at Whitehall.

At this time, Leibniz's most famous work was his *Arte Combinatoria* (1666), in which he cited his studies in Lullist-Cabalistic methods as a major influence on his mathematical breakthroughs.²⁵¹ Like Moray, he had eagerly anticipated Kircher's treatise on the Lullist "Combinatory Art," *Ars Magna Sciendi sive Combinatoria*, which was reviewed for the Royal Society in December 1669.²⁵² After Leibniz departed on 9 February 1673, Moray proposed him as a Fellow in March. From this brief contact with a Scottish Freemason, a tradition developed in Germany that Leibniz participated in the fusion of Rosicrucianism into Masonry that allegedly occurred in seventeenth-century Britain.²⁵³ Though the irascible Hooke did not befriend Leibniz, his diary reveals a context that suggests not only Rosicrucian but Masonic influences on the Royal Society during this period.

Throughout autumn 1672, Hooke was frequently in Moray's company, and he worked with Wren on important building projects.²⁵⁴ He studied architectural treatises by Serlio and Vitruvius, while he supervised and assisted various master masons and their craftsmen.²⁵⁵ On 2 November he recorded, "Saw model of St. Pauls approved by the King." On 5 December he bought Marvell's *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, which featured the first published reference to the Mason's Word by an Englishman.²⁵⁶ It was perhaps Hooke and Wren who tried to help Moray complete his research on operative masonry, for a "Direction for Inquiries" concerning building stones, stone-cutting tools, and quarries was issued by the Royal Society on 21 April 1673. Referring to the expert stone work involved in the Culross

²⁵¹ F. Yates, *Art of Memory*, 173–98, 380–81.

²⁵² *Philosophical Transactions*, IV, no. 54, 1093.

²⁵³ See Christoph G. Murr, *Über den wahren Ursprung der Rosenkreutzer und des Freymaurerordens* (Sulzbach: J.E. Seidel, 1803), 17–18, 68–69; Johann G. Buhle, *Über den Ursprung und die vornehmsten Schicksale der Orden der Rosenkreutzer und Freymaurer* (Göttingen, 1804).

²⁵⁴ M.A.R. Cooper, "Robert Hooke's Work as Surveyor for the City of London in the Aftermath of the Great Fire," *Notes and Records of the Royal Society*, 51 (1997), 161–74; 52 (1998), 25–38, 205–20.

²⁵⁵ For Leibniz, Moray, and Masons, see R. Hooke, *Diary*, 7–9, 12, 15, 25, 38, 45.

²⁵⁶ For the political context of Marvell's reference, see Chapter Eleven.

undersea mine, which “belonged to the Earl of Kincardine’s forefathers,” the appeal called for information on a lost Vitruvian technique for hardening steel to cut freestone,

... the retrieving of which skill would be of good use, now that curiosities of workmanship begin to recover, and many eminent persons do countenance and encourage endeavours of such commendable practices as were familiar to the Ancients, and improve what they know of them ... with new additions and inventions, which in this knowing and inquisitive age is like to be driven on as far as humane industry can go. Some curious and intelligent persons have of late already taken laudable pains in this very art.²⁵⁷

The appeal may have helped, for on 31 May 1673 Hooke noted, “Read Sir R. Moray of Masonry &c.” This reference is especially intriguing, for Moray’s long-awaited treatise on Masonry may have ended up among Hooke’s papers. Then, on 4 July Hooke observed sadly,

This evening Sir R. Moray died suddenly ... He is lamented of all. The King testifyd of him to be a good man that never did any injury butt endeavord to doe good to every one, that he had never spoken against one to him, &c. He Dyed Poor and seem to have been much afflicted with somewhat that troubled his mind.²⁵⁸

Hooke not only shared Moray’s Masonic interests but he pursued the Scot’s studies in Jewish architecture and Solomonian traditions. As we shall see in the next chapter, Hooke would subsequently provide an important clue to the mystery of Rabbi Leon’s secret Masonic mission to London and to the clandestine Rosicrucian associations of the Royal Society.

²⁵⁷ *Philosophical Transactions*, VIII, no. 93, pp. 6010–15.

²⁵⁸ R. Hooke, *Diary*, 49–50.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

FROM RESTORATION TO REVOLUTION: MASONIC ARCHITECTS OF TOLERANCE OR TYRANNY? (1664–1685)

שלמה מלך Ⓢ Solomon Melech †

And after many days Charles did reign in ye land and lo his blood was spilled upon ye earth even by ye traitor Cromwell. Behold now ye return of pleasant [illegible] . . . for doth not ye Son of ye Blessed Martyr rule over ye whole land. Long may he reign in ye land and govern ye Craft. Is it not written ye shall not hurt ye Lords anointed.

למה רנשו נים ולאמם יהנרדיק:

—Treloar MS. “Ye History of Masonry” (1665)

London was rebuilding apace . . . so that the Fellow Crafts were never more employ’d than in this Reign, nor in a more lofty Stile; and many Lodges were constituted throughout the Islands by leave of the several Grand Masters . . .

—James Anderson, *Constitutions of Freemasons* (1738)

From the time of Charles II’s oral commitments to the Jews at the Restoration, his philo-Semitic policies over the next twenty-five years fueled a secretive tradition of Jewish-Masonic collaboration that emerged dramatically in the next century. Moreover, this tradition would be strongest in the Rosicrucian degrees of *Écossais* rites developed by exiled supporters of the Stuart dynasty. Because this linkage of Jews and Freemasons would prove so controversial and volatile, it is important to examine the Stuart context that fueled the rumors and the reality. Though the question of Stuart sympathy for Catholicism was the burning public issue of the latter part of Charles II’s reign, it was intrinsically linked with less known but broader issues of tolerance that would eventually define the “modern” Masonic theme of universal brotherhood. In the Stuart Temple of Wisdom, not only Protestants and Catholics but Jews and Moslems would be welcomed as comrades in chivalric fraternity.

The king’s policy of toleration was especially important in the colonies, where many Scottish royalists hoped to exploit new trading

opportunities. In Tangier, the projected gateway to the Levant, the governors' cooperation with Jewish interpreters was crucial to completion of the great Mole and stone forts, projects of continuing interest to Moray and Wren. To facilitate the Barbados trade in which Davidson, Lauderdale, and other Scots were heavily invested, the king granted full privileges to their Jewish agents.¹ In January 1663 Charles and his foreign secretary Arlington established a new precedent by allowing a naturalised Jew from Barbados, the diamond merchant Da Vega, to become a Freeman of a Company in London.² Though Charles still could not count on parliamentary support, he communicated to various Portuguese Jews in April that "he was resolved to grant" permission to a large number of Marranos to immigrate to England.³

When Jacob Abendana dedicated Halevi's *Kuzari* to Davidson, the royalist panegyric smoothed the way for his brother Isaac Abendana to bring copies of the work to England and to establish himself as a Hebrew teacher at Cambridge in 1663.⁴ The king's policy also opened the doors for renewed Hebrew studies in Scotland, where it was well-known that Lauderdale was an expert in the language. One Jew travelled to Scotland, where he instructed Patrick Gordon, who became Professor of Hebrew at King's College, Aberdeen.⁵ At St. Andrews the king donated £50 for a Professor of Hebrew, while at Edinburgh a converted Jew was invited to teach Jewish language and history.⁶ However, despite Charles's policy of toleration, the Jews were still vulnerable to anti-Semitic attacks. In August 1664, when the Earl of Berkshire and some Puritan partisans tried to blackmail the Hebrew community in London, the Jews petitioned Charles for protection. The king's reply was signed by Arlington:

His majesty having considered this Petition hath been graciously pleased to declare that hee hath not given any particular order for ye molesting or disquieting ye Petitioners either in their Persons or Estates, but that they may promise themselves ye effects of ye same favour as for-

¹ W. Samuel, "Review of . . . Barbados," 25-27, 44.

² N. Roth, "Social and Intellectual Currents," 182-83.

³ L. Wolf, "Jewry," 157.

⁴ D. Katz, "Abendana Brothers," 37-38.

⁵ G. Black, "Beginnings," 473.

⁶ A. Levy, "The Origins of Scottish Jewry," *TJHSE*, 20 (1959-61), 134-35.

merly they have had so long as they demean themselves peaceably and quietly with due obedience to his Majesties Laws & without scandal to his Government.⁷

For many Jews, this document was considered the fundamental charter of toleration. In response, Rabbi Jacob Sasportas wrote from London to a friend in Rotterdam:

We live at a time in which God has seen fit greatly to ameliorate the condition of his people, bringing them forth from the general condition of serfdom into freedom . . . specifically, in that we are free to practise our own true religion . . . a written statement was issued from him [Charles II], duly signed affirming that no untoward measures had been or would be initiated against us, and that they should not look towards any protector other than his Majesty; during the continuance of whose lifetime they need feel no trepidation because of any sect that might oppose them, inasmuch as he himself would be their advocate and assist them with all his power.⁸

Shane observes that it was the king's answer "which established the right of the Jews to re-settle in England rather than the non-committal reply which Cromwell had earlier given to the petition of Menasseh ben Israel."⁹ Arlington, whom Anderson identified as a Freemason, would later be involved with Rabbi Leon's visit to London.

Encouraged by the king's policy, the London Jews began raising funds for the enlargement of their synagogue. They probably learned from their Dutch brothers that Leon's architectural theories received international exposure and critical praise, when Johan Saubert published an expanded Latin version of the rabbi's treatise, *De Templo Hierosolymitano* (1665). The translation was printed at the request of Duke Augustus of Brunswick, and Saubert included Leon's Hebrew song of praise for Augustus. When the book first appeared, the latter's brother Duke Frederick of Brunswick visited the Royal Society on 25 February 1665.¹⁰ Thus, Wren and the Fellows could have learned about the architectural explications and designs that Leon contributed to the edition. Moray, especially, would have been interested in Kircher's letter to Saubert, in which his "epistolar correspondent"

⁷ L. Wolf, "Jewry," 33.

⁸ D. Katz, *Jews in History*, 143.

⁹ A. Shane, "Leon," 158.

¹⁰ T. Birch, *History*, II, 9.

praised Leon's treatise. On 31 October 1664 Kircher sent Saubert his critical evaluation, which the latter published in the edition:

I also read with utmost enthusiasm your book about the Temple of Solomon, which your zeal for the public good and your concern for illumination ensured the publication at your own personal expense. It is a quite exceptional work and one which the literary world could not but value for its exposition of the minutiae.¹¹

Saubert included a portrait of Leon, placed above his models of the Tabernacle and Temple, and an admiring biography, which recognized his importance as a *Jewish* savant. He also noted Leon's disagreement with Villalpando's explications of Jewish architecture, which the large fold-out engravings of Leon's designs demonstrated. Drawing purely on Jewish sources, including the "Kabbalistas," Leon made clear that he hoped for an actual rebuilding of the Temple and thus included practical advice relevant to operative masons involved in synagogue and church construction. He described the columns of Jachin and Boaz, the sculptured Cherubim, and the *lapis foundationis*—all subjects of interest to Jewish and Christian builders in London.

With Jews in Britain and its colonies, as well as their co-religionists on the Continent, now perceiving Charles II as their protector, the earlier Stuart support for Leon's architectural endeavors possibly provoked a Hebraic Masonic tribute. In a manuscript entitled "Ye History of Masonry," written by Thomas Treloar in 1665, there is a striking merger of Scottish Masonic tradition and Hebrew royalist panegyric. An inscription on the manuscript reads: "History and Charges of Masonry, Copied by me Jon Raymond MDCCV."¹² In the surviving fragment, there are inscriptions in Hebrew lettering which reinforce the stress on Jewish and Solomonic traditions in the restored fraternity. Unfortunately, some words are missing or illegible (as indicated by ellipses). The text begins with the Hebrew inscription, "in the beginning God created the heaven and earth," and then recounts the story of Hiram the architect:

¹¹ *Jacobi Jehuda Leonis de Templo Hierosolymitano . . . ex Ebraeo Latine Recensisit à Johanne Sauberto* (Helmstadt: Jacob Mullerus, 1665), Libri IV, [d.2]. I am grateful to Robert Shaw-Smith for translation from the Latin.

¹² Reproduced by John Thorpe in "Old Masonic Manuscript. A Fragment," *Lodge of Research*, N. 2429 Leicester. *Transactions for the Year 1926-27*, 40-48.

Master Hiram from near ye sea,
 A son of a widow was sent to me,
 Solomon, I, King Davids Son
 Of ye Stock of ye Blessed One
 Not having . . . Mason ye land
 Received . . . Craftsman . . . by ye hand
 All may witness my seal and hand

The text then relates a highly Judaised version of the Old Charges, adding peculiar details and claiming Jewish sources for the discoveries of Euclid and Pythagoras. McLeod observes that in standard English texts of the Old Charges, Solomon's Temple is simply one episode of many and not the most important at that:

Euclid and Edwin both claim considerably more space. But for Jon Raymond [and Treloar] Solomon is at centre stage right from the preliminary verses. He includes an attestation, "All may witness my seal and hand," with the "signature" of "Solomon the King" (in Hebrew letters and in transliterated Hebrew) and "Solomon's Seal," the hexalpha within a circle. He adduces the Tabernacle of Moses as a prototype of the Temple. He describes the artificer of the Temple in these terms: "And Hiram the Tyrian widow's son was sent to King Solomon by Hiram the King of Tyre. And he was a cunning workman in brass and purple and all medals."¹³

McLeod expresses puzzlement at this "remarkably early" naming of the architect as Hiram, but Stevenson suggests that the Hiramic legend in Scottish Freemasonry was already present in William Schaw's time. Thus, "the mental lodge" or "memory temple" described in late seventeenth-century catechisms contained the grave of Hiram, "the greatest of all architects."¹⁴ Through certain Cabalistic and necromantic rituals, the initiate could discover and rejuvenate Hiram. The emphasis on his role as the "widow's son" pointed to Charles II's role as Henrietta Maria's son—a Stuart reference that would take on more poignant significance for Jacobite exiles in the next century.

Even more striking in the Treloar MS. were the unique references to certain sixteenth- and seventeenth-century monarchs claimed as rulers of "the whole Craft":

¹³ Wallace McLeod, "Additions to the List of Old Charges," *AQC*, 96 (1983), 98–99.

¹⁴ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 163.

And yet another Henry did rule over ye whole Craft even ye seventh of that name.

And after many days Charles did reign in ye land and lo his blood was spilled upon ye earth even by ye traitor Cromwell.

Behold now ye return of pleasant for doth not ye Son of ye blessed Martyr rule over ye whole land.

Long may he reign in ye land and govern ye Craft.

Is it not written ye shall not hurt ye Lords anointed.

The elimination of Henry VIII and Elizabeth I from Masonic history should not surprise, for they were considered enemies of ecclesiastical and royalist building projects. But the omission of James VI and I possibly indicates that James was not recognised as “governor” over English Masons, despite his initiation in Scotland. Or perhaps Treloar did not believe that true “Hiramic” Freemasonry really existed in England until the restoration of Charles II.

The Treloar MS. concludes its powerful royalist statement with an inscription in Hebrew, “Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing?” This quotation from Psalm 2 was often applied to the radical Protestants of the Interregnum, and the rebellious heathen were subsequently admonished to serve the Lord’s anointed king. In the year when the manuscript was written, the Jewish community in London must have worried that religious sectarians in Britain were linking their cause to Jewish millenarian developments in the Middle East. Reports of the messianic claims of Sabbatai Zevi, a Cabalistic prophet in Smyrna, stimulated waves of enthusiasm among many Jews on the Continent. Queen Christina became so fascinated by Sabbatai’s claims that she almost became a disciple. In Hamburg she danced in the streets with her Jewish friends in anticipation of the apocalyptic moment.¹⁵ In London Oldenburg eagerly sought news about the movement from the alchemist Borri, the chiliast Serrarius, and the philosopher Spinoza, which revived his millenarian hopes—and made him vulnerable to royalist suspicions of sedition.¹⁶

In November 1665 Robert Boulter published in London a Sabbatian message to serve the agenda of radical dissidents, who opposed Charles II’s policy of toleration. He claimed that he received a letter from Aberdeen which described the arrival on the Scottish coast

¹⁵ S. Akerman, *Christina*, 188–94.

¹⁶ H. Oldenburg, *Correspondence*, II, 481, 637; III, 447.

of a mysterious ship, loaded with Hebrew-speaking Jews who were gathering their brethren from all over the world to return to Jerusalem.¹⁷ The Sabbatians boldly proclaimed on their satin sails, "THESE ARE THE TEN TRIBES OF ISRAEL," who would give liberty of conscience to all (except the Turks). It is unclear whether Boulter believed there were actual Jews living in Scotland, or whether he hoped to insult the Scots and their Stuart king by implying that they were Jewish.

Meanwhile in Amsterdam, some Jewish admirers of Sabbatai Zevi hoped that the English king would assist them, despite the current state of war between England and Holland which had spread to the Mediterranean. In February 1666 Juan de Yllan, a merchant adventurer and colonial promoter, wrote to Charles II:

Since I behold that god in his mercy had begun to gather in his scattered people and has raised up a prophet for us, therefore I and several of my Jewish brethren, together with fifty poor families desire to hire a ship to bring us to Jerusalem. And in order that this may be accomplished without being captured or molested on the high sea, we humbly petition Your Majesty to grant us a pass for one Dutch ship which is to sail from here . . . without let, search, of molestation by vessels of His Majesty's fleet, and after arriving in Jerusalem we shall pray for his Majesty's success.¹⁸

Yllan counted on Charles's good will, as demonstrated by his tolerant policy towards the Jews, but he was unaware of the exploitation of the Sabbatian issue by the king's sectarian opponents.

When Sabbatai Zevi—under threat of death—apostasized to Islam, the royalists in Britain were relieved that the potentially incendiary movement fizzled out. There is little evidence that Jews in London supported the campaign, which threatened to undermine their delicate position under the king's protection. Oldenburg, however, continued to correspond about the millenarian implications of the affair, and his indiscrete comments to friends in Holland during the Anglo-Dutch war placed him under government suspicion. Letters from the radical Serrarius were impounded, and an order for Oldenburg's

¹⁷ Reprinted in R.B. [Nathaniel Crouch], *Memorable Remarks Upon the Ancient and Modern State of the Jewish Nation* (Bolton: B. Jackson, 1786), 48, 125–63; also, Cecil Roth, *Anglo-Jewish Letters, 1158–1919* (London: Soncino, 1938), 67–69.

¹⁸ Zvi Loker, "Juan de Yllan, Merchant Adventurer and Colonial Promoter: New Evidence," *Studia Rosenthaliana*, 17 (1983), 23.

arrest was issued in summer 1667.¹⁹ Evelyn noted that Oldenburg was held a close prisoner in the Tower “for having been suspected to write Intelligence, etc.”²⁰ Because Evelyn appreciated the secretary’s work for the Royal Society, he got permission from Arlington to visit Oldenburg in the Tower, and he came away confident that he was innocent of seditious intent. However, Oldenburg’s interest in Sabbatian millenarianism was still considered risky, and he was not released until a month after the signing of the Treaty of Breda.²¹

The perceived linkage between Sabbatians and Protestant subversives possibly spurred Solomon Franco to publish a royalist panegyric, *Truth Springing Out of the Earth*, which he dedicated to Charles II on 2 July 1668. As Hebrew instructor of Ashmole, Franco may have learned that Ashmole’s friend Evelyn was now undertaking a study of Sabbatai Zevi and similar radical enthusiasts. In his pamphlet, Franco announced his conversion to the Church of England, which he credited to the miraculous nature of Charles II’s restoration and to the arguments of Christian friends that the Cabala proved that Jesus was the Messiah. He stressed that the ancient Jews were devoted to monarchy and that rebels against the king were punished with death. Franco was also determined to defend Cabalistic traditions against critics like Samuel Parker, who two years earlier had ridiculed Rosicrucian exponents of Cabala.

Perhaps Franco also hoped to forestall Evelyn’s potential criticism of Sabbatai Zevi’s Cabalistic pretensions. Thus, he gave detailed expositions of Cabalistic traditions of the male and female Cherubim, the role of the *Shekinah* in reception of divine influx, the architecture of the Temple, etc. In a passage with Masonic resonance, Franco affirmed: “The Temple, which is the Heart of the World, whose Influence is communicated to all parts of the Body, which now is of Stone, after the coming of the Messias shall be of flesh.”²² With Cabalistic study reclaimed by Franco as permissible for royalist Christians, Evelyn’s exposé of the Sabbatian movement was rendered less threatening to Jews (and Marranos) who enjoyed the protection of the king.

In *The History of the Three Late Famous Impostors* (1669), dedicated

¹⁹ H. Oldenburg, *Correspondence*, III, xxvi–vii, 447.

²⁰ J. Evelyn, *Diary*, II, 278; III, 491.

²¹ Charles Webster, *From Paracelsus to Newton* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982), 28.

²² S. Franco, *Truth*, 58.

to Arlington, Evelyn linked Christian partisans of the Sabbatians with Cromwellian radicals, who still posed a threat to the Stuart regime:

But whil'st the Time is not yet accomplish'd, I could wish our modern Enthusiasts, and other prodigious sects amongst us, who Dreame of the like Carnal Expectations, and a Temporal Monarchy, might seriously weigh how nearly their Characters approach the Style and Design of these Deluded Wretches [Jewish Sabbatians], least they fall into the same Condemnation, and the Snare of the Devil.²³

Evelyn presented a copy to Charles II, who appreciated the blow struck at seditious millenarians. On 13 February 1669 Evelyn recorded that the king told him of "other like cheates." Unfortunately, the uproar caused by the Sabbatian movement, which Evelyn believed to include millions of Jews, caused him to harden his own religious position and call for their necessary Christian conversion—a position not shared by the king.

Despite the attacks by militant Protestants, Charles II continued to welcome pacific Rosicrucians and Cabalists to his court. In October 1670, while attending the Newmarket races, he was joined by F.M. van Helmont, who was a longtime friend of Prince Rupert, the king's cousin and partner in chemical and artistic studies.²⁴ Unfortunately, it is unknown if Van Helmont also met Moray, who often worked with Rupert at that time. Moray was familiar with Van Helmont's *Alphabetum Naturae*, which Oldenburg had reviewed for the Royal Society in January 1668, noting that Van Helmont learned Hebrew so well that he understood the whole Hebrew Bible.²⁵ The "Judaizing Rosicrucian" then visited Henry More and Anne Conway, who were currently studying the works of Hendrik Niklaes, founder of the "Family of Love." Though Conway defended Familist doctrines, More criticized them as similar to Quaker beliefs. Van Helmont's Hebrew studies would soon stimulate Cabalistic interest and controversy in the mystical circles of Conway, More, and George Keith, the Scottish Quaker.

With the Sabbatian movement and its millenarian supporters now discredited, Charles II expressed his appreciation for the loyalty of the Jews by appointing many of them as "sworn brokers," beginning

²³ John Evelyn, *The History of the Three Late Famous Impostors (1669)*, introd. C.W. Grose. Augustan Reprint Society, 131. (Los Angeles: Clark Memorial Library, 1968).

²⁴ A. Coudert, *Impact*, 155–56, 180–81.

²⁵ *Philosophical Transactions*, II, no. 31, pp. 602–04.

in 1671 and continuing throughout his reign.²⁶ At the same time, royalist authors felt free to revive their traditional Jewish themes. Roger Boyle, the Irish Earl of Orrery, had served with Monk in Scotland and collaborated in his secret restorationist plans. He now composed several Stuart plays which called for Solomonic-Hermetic conciliation. These dramatic pieces were also resonant with “speculative” Masonic themes, which seemed targeted at the cognoscenti. A practising architect who worked closely with local masons, Orrery was currently involved in major construction projects for the Stuart government in Ireland.²⁷

In 1671 Orrery drafted *Herod the Great*, which drew heavily on Josephus’s accounts of *The Jewish War* and *The Antiquities of the Jews*. Set in Jerusalem in the period of the Second Temple, the play featured a heroic Jewess, Mariamne, “who is the epitome of wifely loyalty and high-principled womanhood.”²⁸ Contemporaries would identify her with Queen Catherine, who endured her husband’s philandering with such loyalty and dignity that even he admired her. Catherine was also known as a friend and protector of Jews. Orrery worked with Webb to design an elaborate production by the King’s Company to be held in January 1672, but a fire destroyed the Theatre Royal. From the script, it is clear that Orrery intended stunning views of the Temple, which would appear mysteriously while singing priests in white robes praise Herod on his sumptuous throne. Amidst the corruption, sensuality, and violence of the Hebrew court, certain noble Jews were willing to die in order to save a friend. Thus, the themes of elevated conjugal love and mystical friendship were linked with the good Jews who tried to regenerate Jerusalem and the Temple.

In *The Tragedy of King Saul*, composed circa 1671 but published posthumously, Orrery further elaborated the theme of fraternal bonding. As David and Jonathan make vows of eternal friendship (“one Soul in both our Bodies be”), they stand in contrast to oath-breakers who lift their hands against the Lord’s anointed.²⁹ The royalist panegyrics occur amidst scenes of a mystically-shrouded Temple, magician’s cave, flying spirits, and prophetic visions. As in *Herod*, the

²⁶ Dudley Abrahams, “Jew Brokers of the City of London,” *MJHSE*, III (1937), 87–88.

²⁷ R. Loeber, *Biog. Dict.*, 25–27.

²⁸ Roger Boyle, *The Dramatic Works of Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery*, ed. W.S. Clark (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1937), I, 89; II, 601–13.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, II, 718–19.

royal tent and throne express symbolic Hebraic design. Orrery—and perhaps Webb's theatrical masons—saw these heroic Jewish themes as an antidote to the increasing factionalism of the times.

In the period before Webb's death in October 1672, he affirmed that he personally carried on the true architectural and masque traditions of Inigo Jones. Moreover, he possessed an almost unique ability to "initiate" craftsmen into the "mysteries of the Scenical Art."³⁰ He obviously influenced Orrery, who would carry the Jones-Webb tradition to extravagant heights in *The Tragedy of Zoroastres* (1675), which was never performed publicly. Orrery answered critics of the Hermetic tradition by utilising J.H. Ursinus's *De Zoroastre Bactriano, Hermete Trismegisto* (1661), which included interpretations of Hermes ranging from the Cabalists' *Sepher Raziel* to Kircher's *Oedipus*.³¹ Portraying Zoroaster as "ye first Magician," Orrery featured magical rituals, conjured spirits, heavenly visions, oaths of secrecy, and temples of Cupid and Mars.

Though neither Orrery nor Webb received adequate recognition for their late theatrical work, they may well have initiated the combination of Jewish ritual, Temple mysticism, Cabalistic conjugal love, and Hermetic chivalry—all within a framework of microcosmic architecture—that would be driven from the public stage into the private lodge after the Stuarts were driven from the British throne. As one reads Orrery's plans for Middle Eastern temples and choruses of Jewish priests, one thinks forward to Mozart's *Magic Flute*, in which the great Masonic musician expressed the ideals of his *Écossais* brethren, who like their seventeenth-century predecessors, hoped to stand on the level with kings.

Orrery was widely recognised as a proponent of architecture and the New Science, as well as a royalist playwright. As an Irishman, though a Protestant, he was also distrusted by some English courtiers and virtuosos. His brother Robert Boyle and friends Moray and Evelyn were all leaders in the Royal Society, and Orrery found himself the target of critics of their scientific enterprise. To the surprise of royalist Fellows, the first public attacks on traditional Stuart notions of Platonic love, Pythagorean cosmology, chivalric fraternity, and

³⁰ H. Colvin, *Biog. Dict.*, 506.

³¹ R. Boyle, *Dramatic Works*, II, 633; Johannes Heinrich Ursinus, *De Zoroastre Bactriano, Hermete Trismegisto* (Nuremberg, 1661), 78, 90, 193, 207.

scientific virtuosity came from within the Royal Society, when Buckingham joined with Samuel Butler and Thomas Sprat to write *The Rehearsal*, first performed in December 1671. Aimed mainly at Dryden's pompous style of heroic drama, the rollicking satire also parodied Orrery's elevated themes and Webb's scenic innovations.

Sprat, who had been commissioned by the Royal Society to write its official history, used his inside knowledge to lampoon Dryden's attempt to apply scientific methodology to play-writing. The character Bayes (modelled on Dryden) is a virtuoso who reduces to minimalist absurdity the scientific rules of dramaturgy in order to produce unnatural speech and absurd plots, while his friend at Gresham College will concoct some "spirit of Brains" to augment the stewed prunes he uses for creative stimulation.³² With oblique reference to the embattled position of Charles II and Duke of York, Buckingham further mocked Orrery's themes of fraternal bonding and conjugal love. But his funniest scenes lampooned the chivalric themes of the Irishman's early plays, *The Siege of Rhodes* and *Mustapha*, which featured the idealistic Grand Master Villiers and various illuminated knights. Buckingham transformed them into heroic buffoons: "I drink, I huff, I strut, look big and stare;/ And all this I can do, because I dare." In the final act, the scenic architecture and illusionistic staging that expressed the Platonic and Pythagorean philosophy of earlier Stuart masques were mocked as mere "state, shew, and magnificence," while Bayes happily admits, "I mean not words, for those I do not value."

When the vulgarized "kings of Brentford" descend bumpily in a chariot through gaseous clouds, the satire seemed to go too far for John Evelyn, who shared the very values satirized by the dramatists: "Went to see the Duke of Buckingham's ridiculous farce and rhapsody, called *The Recital*, buffooning all plays, yet profane enough."³³ That the king, court, and popular audience enjoyed the play must have seemed ominous to Evelyn, who worried about the decaying standards of royalist culture. Thus, in spring 1672 Evelyn was pleased when Ashmole published *The Institution, Laws, and Ceremonies of the Most Noble Order of the Garter*, which functioned as a serious counter-statement to Buckingham's lampoon. Though Buckingham himself

³² George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, *The Rehearsal*, ed. D.E.L. Crane (Durham: Durham UP, 1976), 4–5, 18, 49, 52.

³³ J. Evelyn, *Diary*, III, 599.

received the Garter in 1649, he was annoyed that Arlington—his political rival and satirical target—was installed in the order in June 1672.³⁴

Ashmole's great work stood in stark contrast to the increasingly cynical degeneracy of Buckingham and other opportunistic courtiers; it called for the preservation of the chivalric ideals and loyalty of an earlier golden age. The publication was the culmination of seventeen years of research, which began during the Interregnum, when the Garter suffered "almost a Totall Ecclips." As Josten observes, "in 1655, the survival of the Order of the Garter depended entirely on the precarious chances of the monarchy then in exile."³⁵ With the help of Christopher Wren's father and uncle, who served as deans of Windsor, Ashmole studied the archives of the order and a vast number of foreign sources on the history of knighthood.

For the section on the Scottish Order of the Thistle, Ashmole was assisted by Lauderdale and Sir Charles Erskine, "now Lyon, King of Arms in Scotland."³⁶ At the Restoration Ashmole had been commissioned by the king to search Scottish records, so he had long-established ties with Scottish students of knighthood and heraldry.³⁷ In the eighteenth-century, Jacobite Freemasons claimed a link between the Garter and their higher chivalric degrees. Though Ashmole, Lauderdale, and Wren *filii* were Masons, there is no surviving evidence in England of organized Garter-Masonic links during the period of Ashmole's Garter studies. There were overlaps of membership between Garter knights and alleged Masons—such as Buckingham, Monk, Richmond, St. Albans, Arlington, and Lauderdale—which may have fueled a merging of some traditions. However, that fusion seemed to take place in Scotland and Ireland rather than England.

Arguing against Ashmole's role in assimilating Garter traditions into English Freemasonry is the short shrift he gave to the relevant Hebraic and French elements that were central to traditional histories of the craft. Though he drew heavily on Favyn's *Theatre of Honour*,

³⁴ He would later mock the Garter in "Upon the Installment of Sir Thomas Osborn and the Duke of Newcastle"; see Christine Phipps, *Buckingham: Public and Private Man* (New York: Garland, 1985), 151.

³⁵ C. Josten, *Ashmole*, I, 112, 179–80.

³⁶ Elias Ashmole, *The Institution, Laws, and Ceremonies of the Most Noble Order of the Garter* (1672; facs. rpt. London: Frederick Muller, 1971), 98–99.

³⁷ M. Hunter, *Science*, 34.

he downplayed the French author's account of the Jewish origin of orders of knighthood:

... we may observe from stories yet more ancient [than the Roman], some things bearing proportion or resemblance to these modern Societies of Knighthood. And this, though we do not take any great notice of certain old Rabinical Comments, concerning the Anakim, or Sons of Anak, who (according to Bouldouchius) were a Society of valiant men, imagined to have been called . . . Torquati, Knights, endowed with a Chain or Collar . . . and the Order thereof to have been instituted at the building of the city of Hebron.³⁸

Ashmole recounted the role of Charles Martel in founding the Order of the Gennet, but he raised questions about the reliability of Favyn's account of this "first Order of Knighthood among the French." More tellingly, Ashmole made no links between Martel and Freemasonry, thus ignoring traditional Masonic accounts of Martel's role as a patron of the fraternity. Because Ashmole did emphasise the role of King Edward III in the construction of the Chapel of St. George, which became home to Garter ceremonies, he was perhaps influenced by traditional English Francophobia in his treatment of Martel. He noted that Edward ordered the "master of the Stone-hewers" to impress "so many Masons and other Artificers as were necessary" to build the new chapel, but he did not discuss the unhappy relationship between king and craftsmen at that time.

Ashmole dedicated his history to Charles II and presented him with a lavish edition in May 1672. Both the king and his brother James were greatly impressed with the work, and they would use it as a prestigious gift to foreign dignitaries. Given their tolerance for Catholicism, the royal brothers must have regretted the loss of so much Catholic chivalric tradition in Protestant Britain. Moreover, as admirers of the contemporary Knights of Malta, they were probably interested in Ashmole's sympathetic account of the Knights Templar and the merging of their traditions into, successively, the Knights of the Hospital, Rhodes, and Malta. Moreover, Ashmole probably shared the belief of his close friend Lilly that the Knights of Rhodes were equivalent to the Templars.³⁹ Unfortunately, it is

³⁸ E. Ashmole, *Institution*, 47.

³⁹ See W. Lilly, *Last of Astrologers*, 1, where he notes that his great-uncle was "one of the Knights of Rhodes, or Templars." Lilly's memoirs, with this statement, were dedicated to Ashmole.

unknown whether Charles and James were aware of the peculiar Scottish history of the Templars, whose traditions survived surreptitiously into the sixteenth century, under the protection of Stewart monarchs.

However, it is possible that Ashmole's history of the Garter and other chivalric fraternities influenced Scottish Masonic developments, through the medium of Lauderdale and Erskine. From 1661 on, royalists in Scotland had celebrated the Restoration by reviving chivalric tournaments, leading one diarist to record his joy at observing "the flower of this kingdom, which for so many years hath been overclouded, and now to see them upon brave horses, prancing in their accustomed places, in tilting, running of races, and such like."⁴⁰ All this occurred under Lauderdale's regime, while he moved between Edinburgh and London. Ashmole recorded Lauderdale's installation in the Garter on 3 June 1672, his participation in the elaborate ceremonies of 1674, and his continuing support of Ashmole's efforts for the order.⁴¹

While contributing to Ashmole's history, Lauderdale and Erskine encouraged a revival of related heraldic interests in Scotland. From Moray and Kincardine, Ashmole possibly learned of their Masonic interpretations of heraldic devices. He connected his own studies of the mystical symbolism of heraldry to his accounts of chivalric fraternities, and it may be relevant that in 1671 Lothian added a gilded volume of *Malta Illustrata* to the Newbattle library catalogue. The book described the role of the Grand Masters of the Knights of Malta as protectors of the "Religion of Jerusalem."⁴² Thus, this confluence of studies in mystical emblems, knightly fraternity, and Scottish Masonry—undertaken by Ashmole, Moray, Kincardine, Lauderdale, Erskine, and Lothian—could explain the brass tablets, found in Stirling and reportedly engraved in the 1670's, which referred to Masonic degrees of Knight Templar and Knight of Malta.⁴³ Drawing on Scots-Irish traditions, Swift would later refer to "Lodges" of the "Knights of Maltha."⁴⁴

⁴⁰ John Nicholls' Diary, in J.G. Fyfe, ed., *Scottish Diaries and Memoirs 1550–1746* (Stirling: Eneas Mackay, 1928), 181. Spelling modernized.

⁴¹ C. Josten, *Ashmole*, III, 1255; IV, 1370–85, 1468–70.

⁴² Kerr's library; Gianni Francisco Abela, *Malta Illustrata* (Malta, 1647).

⁴³ W. Hughan, "Ancient Stirling Lodge," 108. Some English Masons argue that the tablets were engraved in the early eighteenth-century.

⁴⁴ J. Swift, *Prose*, V, 329.

In the wake of Charles II's unpopular alliance with France and his brother James's public revelation of his Catholic conversion in 1674, any glorification of Catholic chivalric orders would provoke hostility from the king's Protestant subjects in England. However, in Scotland there was widespread support for the alliance and a renewal of Franco-Scottish traditions. According to Anderson, the current Grand Master of Scottish Freemasonry was Sir William Bruce, who had served as royal Master of Works since 1671.⁴⁵ Bruce had long worked with Moray and Kincardine, and he was presently undertaking ambitious architectural projects for Lauderdale.⁴⁶ As a collaborator with Ashmole on the history of chivalric fraternities, Lauderdale may have passed on salient information to Bruce and his masons. Ashmole revealed that the Knights of the Garter took an oath of secrecy about affairs of the order and swore obedience to the sovereign and their Knights-Companions.

Encouraged by Lauderdale, Bruce made a special study of contemporary French architecture, which he introduced into many of his projects in Scotland. Like Moray earlier, the two men envisioned a Scotland that reached out to international partners in intellectual, artistic, and economic spheres. Before Moray's untimely death, he had facilitated contacts between virtuosos in Scotland, Sweden, Holland, France, Italy, Africa, and the East Indies. From the selective use of his Mason's Mark in some of this correspondence, it is clear that he believed in an extension of Masonic "scientific" brotherhood into an international sphere.

Ashmole similarly envisioned the Garter as an extension of royalist and fraternal loyalty. Often collaborating with Swedish diplomats and savants, Ashmole made the Garter an important part of the culture of Rosicrucian Enlightenment in Sweden. In discussing this British influence on Swedish pansophism, Seaton observes that installation in the Garter imposed Masonic-style bonds on its Knights-Companions at home and abroad.⁴⁷ It is perhaps relevant that Ashmole planned to follow his history of the Garter with a history of Freemasonry.⁴⁸ Unfortunately, the Masonic documents he collected were

⁴⁵ J. Anderson, *Constitutions* (1738), 104.

⁴⁶ John Dunbar, "The Building-activities of the Duke and Duchess of Lauderdale, 1670-82," *Archaeological Journal*, 132 (1975), 202-30.

⁴⁷ E. Seaton, *Literary Relations*, 111.

⁴⁸ John Campbell, *Biographia Britannica* (London, 1747), I, 224n.E.

destroyed by a fire in the Temple. Like Moray's, Ashmole's projected publication did not come to fruition.

While Buckingham mocked and Ashmole praised the ideals of chivalric brotherhood, Evelyn extended Moray's conception of mystical friendship (*amicitia*) to include a rarified Platonic relationship between a man and woman. Scholars have long been puzzled by the strange designs of "The Altar of Friendship" and symbolic star which Evelyn drew for his "bonded" friend Margaret Blagge, a pious and learned woman more than thirty years his junior. But, as Stevenson reveals, Evelyn reproduced Moray's Mason Mark and personal heraldic emblems in order to express his spiritual and intellectual bonding with Blagge.⁴⁹ Moreover, Evelyn was probably influenced by Moray's similar friendship with Sophia Lindsay in 1668. Perhaps cautioned by the scandalous stories that circulated about Moray's relationship, Evelyn determined to maintain a pure image of his friendship with Blagge, who struggled to preserve her spiritual integrity while serving as maid-in-waiting to the queen and acting in court theatricals.

On 16 October 1672, at Blagge's request, Evelyn entered a solemn bond of mystical and intellectual friendship which would be superior to familial or conjugal love. He sketched an "Altar of Friendship," which represented "the Marriage of Soules"; she then signed it "for my Brother Evelyn" and drew an accompanying pentacle.⁵⁰ Evelyn referred to Solomon's statements on the superiority of friendship to other relationships, and he affirmed "as David did of Jonathan, Her Friendship was to me passing the love of Women." Like Moray's intense friendships with Alexander Bruce, Gilbert Burnet, and Sophia Lindsay (and like James I with his favorites), Evelyn's bond was one of *agape* rather than *eros*. However, there was also a strand of sublimated eroticism, which suggests their mutual practice of Cabalistic meditation or "Isaac's way," as recommended by Henry Vaughan and Moray.⁵¹ In "An Office for the Lord's Day," a manuscript punctuated by Masonic stars, Evelyn instructed Blagge to "think of it as

⁴⁹ D. Stevenson, "Masonry," 418–19; John Evelyn, *The Life of Mrs. Godolphin*, ed. Harriet Simpson (London: Oxford UP, 1939), 210–17.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 22–27.

⁵¹ In *John Evelyn and His Family Circle* (London, 1955, 83, W.G. Hiscock suggests that Evelyn was influenced by Henry Vaughan's *Mount of Olives* (1652), in which Vaughan recommends the meditative prayers of Eliezer, Elias, and "Isaac in the field"; see H. Vaughan, *Works*, I, 146.

going to a marriage feast" in which meditation would bring her to "the bridegroom."⁵²

Like Moray, Evelyn was familiar with the mnemonic-visualization techniques of Lull, Cardano, and Alsted, for he owned many of their works, as well as a manuscript "Tractatus de Memoria Artificialis" and an *Art of Memory* published in London in 1654.⁵³ As noted earlier, in Alsted's chapter on "Mnemonicam," he described the "modus cognitionis kabbalistica," illustrated by drawings of sephirotic circles filled with emblems of the chain of being.⁵⁴ Evelyn seemed to draw on Alsted when he instructed Blagge to meditate by going through many circles emanating from "the eternal Archetype," to reflect from "the creature to the Creator as by a chain of causes . . . from the sublimest Cherubim to the lowest insect."⁵⁵ He concluded with an invocation of the Temple: "O Israel! how great is the House of God! How large the place of his Habitation!"

Blagge's own descriptions of her deliberate development of expertise in memory and cards ("gaming") recall those elements of the Art of Memory, especially as taught by Cardano. Simpson observes that her practice of "felicitous meditation" had a structure and conscious art which required "discipline in concentration and memory."⁵⁶ Like Moray, who described the entrance of the "divine guest" into the "temple" of his bosom, Margaret meditated until she "felt another Soule in her." Evelyn witnessed her meditation at the altar, where she received the "holy symbols" with such melting joy "as seem'd to be something of Transport (not to say Angelick) some thing I cannot describe." Moreover, she confessed to her "brother,"

. . . to have felt in her soule, Such Influxes of heavenly joy, as has almost caryed her into another World; I do not call them Rapt & Elapses . . . but she was sometimes Regald with Extraordinary Favours . . . she Writes to me—O my Friend, how happy was I on Sunday last! . . . I was even disolv'd with love to God.⁵⁷

In Evelyn's and Moray's practice of meditation and friendship, there was a sense of "urgency as well as ecstasy." In accordance with

⁵² British Library: Evelyn MS. 90.

⁵³ Ibid., MS. 20a: "Catalogus Evelynianus" (1687); E. Bernard, *Catalogus*, II, "Evelyn," 94.

⁵⁴ J. Alsted, *Encyclopaedia*, IV, 2270–73.

⁵⁵ British Library: Evelyn MS.130.f.97–99.

⁵⁶ J. Evelyn, *Mrs. Godolphin*, xx–xxi, xvii.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 87.

"the rules of this Science," Moray taught "a kind of Metaphysical Alchimy . . . that searches the very hirnes [corners or crevices] of the fountains without looking after the streames."⁵⁸

Evelyn's unusual bond was accepted (grudgingly) by his wife, and it continued after Blagge's marriage to Lord Godolphin in 1675. Besides the element of symbolic Masonry involved in their pact, Evelyn also rendered service in operative masonry. Because Godolphin was often absent on diplomatic business, Evelyn arranged the construction of a "pretty habitation for her in Scotland Yard," where he worked closely with the architect Robert Hooke and supervised the masons and other workmen.⁵⁹ Hooke in turn consulted Wren about the project.⁶⁰ Though there is no surviving drawing of the "oratory" they designed for her meditation sessions, a hint may be found in Henry Vaughan's *Mount of Olives*, which influenced Evelyn's instructions to his protégé. Vaughan praised the "reverend and sacred buildings (however now vilified and shut up)" where Christians follow the ancient Jews in their "desire and longing for the Courts of the Lord" in the lost Temple.⁶¹

When Mrs. Godolphin became pregnant, Evelyn took her to visit Ashmole at Lambeth, where they inspected his astrological and magical devices. The visit recalls Ashmole's own Rosicrucian adoption by Backhouse, for Margaret considered herself the spiritually-adopted daughter of "brother" Evelyn. Though Evelyn first doubted Ashmole's whispered prediction of an unhappy pregnancy ("I believe him as much a Conjuror as my-self"), the astrologer proved accurate when Mrs. Godolphin developed childbirth fever. Despite the ministration of the alchemical *aurum potabile*, she suffered an agonising death. Over her grave, Evelyn had etched in copper a replica of Moray's pentacle with Greek letters spelling *Agape*, bordered by the words "Un. Dieu . . . Un. Amy" and an astrological sign. When Moray and Evelyn included females in their "Masonic" bonding and adoption, they perhaps foreshadowed the emergence of female Freemasonry and "lodges of adoption" in certain eighteenth-century *Écossais* systems.⁶²

⁵⁸ D. Stevenson, "Masonry," 419.

⁵⁹ J. Evelyn, *Diary*, IV, 98.

⁶⁰ R. Hooke, *Diary*, 253.

⁶¹ "The Mount of Olives," in H. Vaughan, *Works*, I, 147.

⁶² D. Béresniak, *Symbols*, 104–06.0 For a survey of scholarship on female adoptive Masonry, see Janet Burke and Margaret Jacob, "French Freemasonry, Women, and Feminist Scholarship," *Journal of Modern History*, 68 (1986), 513–49.

Evelyn's cultivation of bonded friendship took place in a political environment of disintegrating loyalties among royalist courtiers, which especially effected Moray's old network. Since Lauderdale's marriage to the Countess of Dysart, he had succumbed to her ambition and avarice in his policies for Scotland. It was her jealousy of Moray's high reputation that led to Lauderdale's break with his old friend after 1670, and Lauderdale subsequently lost the support of Kincardine, Tweeddale, Lothian, and Burnet. Sharing Charles II's frustrations with constant parliamentary opposition, he determined to make Scotland "a citadel for the king," which could furnish a loyal army if necessary in England.

Lauderdale also abandoned Moray's policy of moderation in religious affairs and increasingly backed the repressive measures of the Anglican and Scottish bishops. Despite Lauderdale's close collaboration with William Bruce, Master of Works, and with Robert Mylne, royal master mason, other Scottish Freemasons such as Patrick Hume and the Lords Cassillis, Eglinton, and Cochrane participated in the opposition to Lauderdale in the 1670's.⁶³ Lothian, always jealous of Scotland's Presbyterian rights, now studied Milton's *Paradise Lost* (1667) and *Paradise Regained* (1671), which were anathema to the more rigid royalists and Anglicans.⁶⁴ Though some Masonic opponents were motivated by religious bigotry and anti-Catholic fervor, others—like Lothian—acted out of nationalistic motives. A lack of surviving evidence makes it unclear whether the technique of Masonic networks utilized during the early Covenanting movement was revived during this period.

However, one future enemy of Lauderdale was aware of the political significance of the Mason's Word. In September 1672 Andrew Marvell, M.P. for Hull, determined to support the king's "Declaration of Indulgence," which called for full religious toleration. The archdeacon of Canterbury, Samuel Parker, who had earlier mocked Platonic and Rosicrucian enthusiasts, opposed the Indulgence on grounds that it opened the door to Popery and Protestant fanaticism. Determined to protect the new rights of Dissenters, Marvell consulted with Edward Harley and then published *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, which drew on the light-hearted technique of Buckingham's *Rehearsal* in order to ridicule Parker. Using a "constant stream of wit and scurrility,"

⁶³ D. Stevenson, *First Freemasons*, 31–32, 69–71.

⁶⁴ Kerr's library.

Marvell reduced Parker's theological arguments to Quixotic and Cabalistic nonsense:

It were a wild thing for me to Squire it after this Knight, and accompany him here through all his Extravagancies against our Calvinists. You find nothing but Orthodoxy, Systems, and Syntagms, Polemical Theology, Subtilties and Distinctions. Demosthenes; Tankard-bearers; Pragmatical; Controversial: General terms without foundation or reason assigned. That they seem like words of Cabal, & have no significance till they be decipher'd.⁶⁵

Having cleverly thrown back against Parker his sweeping charges of necromancy, astrology, and Cabalism, Marvell made a suggestive Masonic allusion. Noting that historians often cannot distinguish between the Guelphs and the Ghibilines, whose factionalism and animosities greatly disturbed medieval Christendom, he pointed to the identification function of the Mason's Word:

Which of those two were the Nonconformists in those dayes I can no more determine, than which of our Parties here at home is now schismatical. But so nonconformable they were to one another, that the Historian said they took care to differ in the least circumstances of any humane action: and, as those that have the Masons Word, secretly discern one another; so in the peeling or cutting but of an Onion, a Guelph and vice-versa would at first sight have distinguish'd a Ghibiline.⁶⁶

Marvell's published reference to the Mason's Word was the first by an Englishman. But his access to Scottish Masonic tradition probably occurred earlier through his friendship with Edward Harley, who had a Masonic relationship with Moray. Marvell may even have met Moray, when he, Harley, and the Scot were all in Oxford during the meeting of Parliament there in 1665. At that time, Marvell was interested in Hermetic medicine and alchemy and, at the urging of Orrery, he visited Lady Conway for theosophical discussion in 1666.⁶⁷ Over the next years, he demonstrated a keen interest in Scottish affairs and made oblique "Masonic" allusions in his writings.

In late 1669–70 the king and Tweeddale made exploratory moves towards unification of the English and Scottish Parliaments, with the

⁶⁵ Andrew Marvell, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, ed. D.I.B. Smith (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971), 33.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 34–35.

⁶⁷ Lyndy Abraham, *Marvell and Alchemy* (Aldershot: Scolar, 1990), 13–23.

aim of removing trade barriers. From Holyrood Palace, Lauderdale wrote to Moray to express his patriotic misgivings:

Yow cannot imagine what aversion is generall in this Kingdome to the Union. The indeavor to have made us slaves by garrisons & the ruine of our trade by severe lawes in England frights all ranks of men from having to doe with England. What is done is purely in obedience to his Maj'tie, & and it may be the worke was more difficult than is imagined . . . For God's sake let his Maj'tie lay any other punishment on me, no command could be more greevous.⁶⁸

Lauderdale suspected that the English Parliament was stalling on the matter and recognized that any Scot who pushed forward would be considered "most odious as the betrayer of his countrey." Utilizing the privacy of the chemical lab at Whitehall, Moray consulted secretly with the king on potential problems.

It seems likely that Charles then solicited the services of Marvell, whose *Rehearsal Transpros'd* had earlier rendered him valuable support, to contribute supporting propaganda in poetic form. Moreover, Marvell may have become privy to the Masonic communications utilized by Charles, Moray, and Lauderdale for Scottish affairs. In "The Loyall Scot," revised in 1670, Marvell issued a panegyric to Archibald Douglas, former member of the Scottish Regiment in France, who heroically remained with his burning ship while his shipmates fled during a battle with the Dutch. Predicting that "Our English youth shall sing the valiant Scot," he urged the peaceful union of the traditionally hostile nations:

Say but a Scot and streight wee fall to sides:
That syllable like a Picts wall divides.

.....

For shame extirpate from each loyall breast
That senseless Rancour against Interest.
One King, one faith, one Language, and one Isle:
English and Scotch, 'tis all but Crosse and Pile.

Charles our great soul this onely Understands:
Hee our Affection both and will Comands,
And, where twin Simpathies cannot atone,
Knowes the last secret how to make them one.
Just soe the prudent Husbandman who sees
The Idle tumult of his factious bees,

.....

⁶⁸ O. Airy, *Lauderdale Papers*, II, 154.

Powders them ore till none discern their foes
 And all themselves in meal and friendship close.
 The Insect Kingdome streight begins to thrive
 And Each works hony for the Common Hive.⁶⁹

The images of Charles as alchemical king who manipulates sympathetic powders and as bee keeper who powders over faction later emerged in the ritual symbols of Jacobite Freemasonry.⁷⁰ In 1672 Marvell's reference to the Mason's Word occurred in a similar context of support for the king's effort at religious conciliation. However, after Lauderdale and Moray quietly stifled the unification movement, Marvell's propaganda was not needed and the poem was not published. In 1673, when Lauderdale changed his religious position in order to support the repressive policy of the bishops, Marvell added hostile Masonic allusions to the manuscript of "The Loyall Scot." In an anti-prelatical tirade, Marvell linked Lauderdale and the Anglo-Scottish bishops to the degeneration of the Knights Templar and Seth's Pillars:

But who Considers well will find indeed
 'Tis Holy Island parts us not the Tweed.
 Nothing but Clergie could us two seclude:
 Noe Scotch was ever like a Bishops feud.

.....

Never for [Bishop Alexander] Burnetts sake the Lauderdales,
 For Becketts sake Kent alwayes shall have tails.

.....

Enough for them [the Bishops], God knows, to Count their
 Wealth,
 To excommunicate and Study health.

.....

If Wealth or vice can tempt your appetites,
 These Templar Lords Exeed the Templar Knights,

.....

These Hypocrites their faith and Linnen stain.
 Seth's Pillars are no Antique Brick and stone
 But of the Choicest Modern flesh and Bone.

⁶⁹ A. Marvell, *Poems*, I, 187.

⁷⁰ For an *Écossais* embroidery that features a hive and swarming bees which "symbolize the work of the lodge," see D. Béresniak, *Symbols*, 85.

Who views but Gilberts [Sheldon's] Toyls will reason find
Neither before to trust him nor behind.
.....

The Conscious Prelate did not Err,
When for a Church hee built a Theatre.
.....

'Tis necessary to rebabel Pauls,
Indifferent to Rob Churches of their Coals.⁷¹

Though few readers in England would have recognized the Masonic allusions, Marvell's friend Harley who opposed Sheldon and those Scottish Freemasons who opposed Lauderdale would perhaps sense a coded message of support for their cause.

Marvell further scorned "giant Lauderdale" as a "haughty monster," who inflicted Anglican repression "in Scotland *à la mode de France*." In "Nostradamus' Prophecy," Marvell lamented England's fate as he perceived the country lurching towards Francophilia and Scotch-Irish Papism:

When an old Scotch Covenanter shall be
The champion for the English hierarchy;
When Bishops shall lay all religion by,
And strive by law t'establish tyranny;
.....

When th' English prince shall Englishmen despise
And think French only loyal, Irish wise . . .

Perhaps provoked by this poem, Lauderdale's opponent Lothian acquired a new volume of Nostradamus's prophecies.⁷²

Marvell shifted from his earlier praise of Charles as alchemical healer and unifying bee-keeper, and he now portrayed the king as a failed apprentice in the craft of kingship. The poem was published anonymously in 1674 on the occasion of the king's receiving the freedom of the City:

He ne'er knew, not he
How to serve or to be free,
Though he's passed through so many adventures;
But e'er since he was bound
('Tis the same to be crowned)

⁷¹ A. Marvell, *Poems*, I, 182–85.

⁷² Kerr's library.

Has ev'ry day broke his indentures.
 He spends all his days
 In running to plays
 When in his shop he should be poring;
 And wastes all his nights
 In his constant delights
 Of revelling, drinking, and whoring.
 His word nor his oath
 Cannot bind him to troth
 He values not credit nor history;
 And though he has served now
 Two 'prenticeships through
 He knows not his trade nor mystery.⁷³

Ironically, Charles's grandfather James I, who wrote on apprenticeship in the royal craft, would probably have approved of Marvell's diagnosis and recognized the Masonic allusions.

While opposition grew in England and Scotland to the religious policies of king (tolerant) and bishops (authoritarian), the Royal Society went through a period of political factionalism and intellectual decline. Hunter notes that the deaths of Wilkins and Moray, "its leading and most energetic Fellows," engendered the most severe crisis in the society's history.⁷⁴ On 9 August 1673 Henshaw wrote from Copenhagen to Oldenburg and expressed his concern about the impact of their loss:

I have sometime since heard of ye suddain departure of our worthy friend Sr Robt Murry, and have had my part of ye mortification of it . . . I doe not so much as heare whether ye Royall Society bee living or no, certainly it hath received a great blow in ye losse of two such members as ye bishop of Chester [Wilkins] and Sr Robt Murry.⁷⁵

As noted earlier, Henshaw had been a collaborator with Thomas Vaughan in his Hermetic studies, and he perceived Wilkins and Moray as proponents of Rosicrucian-style science which had a spiritual significance and moral purpose.

To critics of the increasingly frivolous theatrical culture of the court, the Royal Society seemed similarly dedicated to superficial play-acting. As Heilbron observes,

⁷³ Quoted in R. Ollard, *Image*, 153–54.

⁷⁴ M. Hunter, *Establishing*, 190.

⁷⁵ H. Oldenburg, *Correspondence*, VI, 129.

Probably the main causes in the decline in experimentation at the Society's meetings were the constraints of novelty and communal participation. Experiments were performances, intended to entertain as well as instruct . . . These practices which no doubt have their origin in natural magic, were difficult to sustain . . . To keep [the king and Fellows] in humor required imagination, industry, some money and, above all, the luck to hit on a series of intriguing effects easily produced, quickly exhibited, and visible and intelligible to a dozen persons of diverse capacities.⁷⁶

Though Buckingham was responsible for one of the most comically theatrical demonstrations at the Royal Society—the uncooperative spider placed within a ring of powdered unicorn horn—he knew how to turn its absurdity to dramatic advantage.⁷⁷ Thus, in *The Rehearsal*, he characterized Bayes (Dryden) as an F.R.S. and “new kind of wit,” who produced “hideous, monstrous things” on stage in the spirit of the new scientists: “your Virtuosi, your civil persons, your Drolls: fellows that scorns to imitate Nature; but are given altogether to elevate and surprise.”⁷⁸

Despite the 1667 publication of Sprat's official history of the society which downplayed alchemical and occult interests among members, hostile critics continued to charge it with Rosicrucian designs. In 1670 Henry Stubbe responded to Sprat's work by charging that the society was subverting the original intention of the founders. He particularly scorned Joseph Glanvil's claim that the society was removing “Rosicrucian vapours” from chemistry, for “the design of introducing a sensible philosophy is the pretence of Crollius, and of the Rosicrusive Orders.”⁷⁹ In *Campanella Revived* (1670), Stubbe further argued, “All that is said about the erecting of Mechanical or Sensible Philosophy of Nature, is but empty talk,” and “no prudent person is to be amused with these Rosicrucian promises.”⁸⁰ Even more damaging was the inclusion of the published transactions of the society in William Cooper's 1673 catalogue of occult books, where Oldenburg's careful summaries were placed next to the Rosicrucian works of Maier, Heydon, and Vaughan.⁸¹

⁷⁶ J.L. Heilbron, *Physics at the Royal Society during Newton's Presidency* (Los Angeles: Clark Library at UCLA, 1983), 13–15.

⁷⁷ T. Birch, *History*, I, 26, 35.

⁷⁸ Buckingham, *Rehearsal*, 3–4.

⁷⁹ Henry Stubbe, *Legends no Histories* (London, 1670), preface, 70.

⁸⁰ Quoted in M. Hunter, *Science*, 118.

⁸¹ William Cooper, bookseller, *A Philosophical Epitaph in Hieroglyphical Figures . . . With a Catalogue of Chymical Books* (London, 1673).

Given the suspicions about his millenarian and Sabbatian beliefs, Oldenburg was especially vulnerable to these charges. Since 1670 he acquired for the society manuscripts and books by Lull, and he corresponded with a French virtuoso about Lull's mnemonic and alchemical techniques.⁸² The Frenchman also sent him the seven hieroglyphical figures of Abraham the Jew, which were used by Flamel in his alchemical exploits. In 1674 Oldenburg assisted Van Helmont and Von Rosenroth in their efforts to publish Hermetic and Cabalistic works. Though Oldenburg became more cautious after his imprisonment, he and other occultist virtuosos were easy targets for public ridicule. In October 1674 one member, identified only as A.B., warned that the Fellows would soon appear like "those miserable Creatures . . . being hooted at by all the Towne for witches." Arguing that "a man may be the author of a good Invention, though neither a perpetual motion, nor the philosophers stone," he called for self-discipline and practicality in their endeavors.

A.B. then made a proposal for reform in order to salvage the society's reputation. Lamenting that "The present posture of this Society & of its affairs, beeing so uneasy, & so unsettled, & and upon both accounts so very unhappy," he used a curious masonic analogy for the task before them:

As to our Work . . . it is not to whiten the walls of an old house, but to build a new one; or, at least, to enlarge the old, & really to mend its faults. And that for this, Materials must be fetched from Observation and Experiment, lying in the two worlds of Nature & Art . . . though a whole pile of bricks is not an house, yet that every batt of a brick, & every lump of lime is concurrent to make it up.⁸³

He called upon the president, who is "our Sun, giving us light, heat & influence," to help the Fellows win back the respect of the king and thus of "the City & Country." It may be relevant that Moray, shortly before his death, designed a new seal featuring "a radiant sun with an eye at the centre," an emblem "later much used in Freemasonry."⁸⁴

A.B. argued that the society should protect its reputation from mockers and wits by adopting a policy of secrecy modelled on that of craftsmen's fraternities:

⁸² See H. Oldenburg, *Correspondence*, VI, 450, 472; X, 401-06; XI, 40-41, 56, 151-53.

⁸³ M. Hunter, *Establishing*, 226-30.

⁸⁴ D. Stevenson, "Masonry," 423.

... for winning the good opinion of most other men, not of our number, we must doe it . . . not by communicateing, unles what we publish, but by beeing reservd. For to be open, will be to expose every thing, either to be catched up by some, or to be droll'd upon by others, or slighted by all. Wheras, on the contrary, a secret is wont to be admired . . . Besides, that it will make Tradesmen & others more free & open, when they understand they may dare to trust their secrets upon us.⁸⁵

A.B.'s proposal was reinforced by Hooke, who became obsessed with the need for secrecy. He proposed that all members take a solemn oath of secrecy and "perfect obedience" to the laws and constitutions of the society. Foreigners should be more stringently examined before acquiring membership, and they should take an even stronger oath than British candidates.

These cautionary measures provoked new scorn from Samuel Butler, who continued to follow the affairs of the society while he worked for Buckingham. In "The Elephant in the Moon" (circa 1675), Butler created a comical scenario in which the virtuosos gaze into a telescope and are astounded by the sight of an elephant and mighty armies on the moon—a discovery that will recover their blighted reputation:

This one Discovery's enough,
To take all former Scandals off—
But, since the World's incredulous
Of all our Scrutinies, and us;
And with a Prejudice prevents
Our best and worst Experiments;
(As if th' were destin'd to miscarry),
In consort try'd, or solitary)
And since it is uncertain, when
Such Wonders will occur agen,
Let us as cautiously contrive,
To draw an exact Narrative
Of what we every one can swear,
Our Eyes themselves have seen appear;
That, when we publish the Account,
We all may take our Oaths upon't.⁸⁶

⁸⁵ M. Hunter, *Establishing*, 231; also, 217, 233–35.

⁸⁶ Samuel Butler, *Satires and Miscellaneous Poetry and Prose*, ed. René Lamar (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1928), 1928), 8–9.

When the young Footboys play with the telescope, they realize that a mouse, gnats, and flies have gotten inside, which are then magnified by the effect of the lens. The virtuosos—bound by their rules of secrecy, obedience, and exclusivity—argue about whether to accept the truth or publish the original vision:

It is no Wonder, w'are cry'd down,
And made the Talk of all the Town,
That rants and swears, for all our great
Attempts, we have done nothing yet,
If ev'ry one have Leave to doubt,
When some great Secret's half-made out;
And 'cause perhaps it is not true,
Obstruct and ruin all we do.
For Truth is too reserv'd, and nice,
T'appear in mixid Societies;
Delights in solit'ry Abodes,
And never shews her self in Crowds.⁸⁷

In a follow-up poem, "Satyr Upon the Royal Society," Butler charged that astrologers in the society make political predictions, while alchemists "stew th' Elixir in a Bath/ Of Hope, Credulity, and Faith."⁸⁸

Butler placed the virtuosos in a contemporary context of Franco-philial, which had disturbing Scottish and even masonic undertones. In "Astrology," he argued that,

The Best Astrologers are always made
Of Crackt Mechaniques, of some other Trade.
.....

For Tradesmen, and Mechaniques are the Primest
And Best of all Astrologers and Chymists.
.....

A Prophet has no need of Being wise
When all his Art, in Dreams, and visions Ly's.
And like a Second sighted Scot
Could foresee, all the Heavens Plot.⁸⁹

Since writing "A Panegyric Upon Sir John Denham's Recovery from his Madness," in which he made detailed charges about Denham's corrupt construction practices (including substandard building materials

⁸⁷ Ibid., 13.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 31–33.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 425–26.

and exploitation of operative masons), Butler kept a sardonic eye on architectural projects, making notes on the relative durability of stone used at the Sheldonian Theatre and Lord Craven's house, "a stately pile" designed by the late Gerbier.⁹⁰

From his vantage point in Holland, Constantijn Huygens also worried about the declining state of the Royal Society, in which he and his son Christiaan had invested so much idealistic and practical energy. If "Solomon's House" were to survive, the British virtuosos needed new inspiration from Bensalem. With peace negotiations finally ending the sporadic wars between Britain and Holland, there was a resumption of contact between the Jewish communities in both nations. Moreover, the liaison occurred within an unusual "Masonic" context. In 1674 the Sephardi community in Amsterdam built a grand new synagogue, which was influenced by Rabbi Leon's arguments and designs.⁹¹ The synagogue featured the massive buttresses which gave the Jerusalem Temple the appearance of a citadel. In London, where Charles II had again confirmed the protected position of the Jews (in response to anti-Jewish pressure in early 1674), the community was so encouraged that they planned the rebuilding and enlargement of their synagogue.⁹² Isaac Alvarez, the king's "court jeweller" and leader of the Creechurch Lane Synagogue, was the prime mover in the building project.⁹³

While Wren and Hooke worked on designs for the rebuilding of St. Paul's, the earlier Stuart determination that it would be the Solomonic Temple of Britain weighed on their minds. As noted earlier, Wren was probably aware of Leon's theories, for his patron Michael Honywood, dean of Lincoln, had brought from Holland a broadsheet describing the Temple model.⁹⁴ At this time, in early 1674, Wren and John Tompson, a London mason, were working with Honywood on the construction of a new cathedral library, where the dean would subsequently display Leon's description of the Temple. It is also possible that Wren saw the Temple model in Paris, where

⁹⁰ Ibid., 120–22; S. Butler, *Prose*, 90, 332; E. Chaney, *Evolution*, 223.

⁹¹ A. Shane, "Leon," 158, 168.

⁹² D.B. de Mesquita, "The Historical Associations of the Ancient Burial Ground of the Sephardi Jews," *TJHSE*, 10 (1923), 238.

⁹³ Wilfred Samuel, "Isaac Alvarez, Court Jeweller," *MJHSE*, III (1937), 100–03.

⁹⁴ A. Shane, "Leon," 154, 146.

it was reportedly exhibited, or even in Holland while travelling to or from Paris.

A contemporary note in Hooke's diary suggests that he and Wren sent Abraham Story, a master mason, to Amsterdam to inspect Leon's design for the new synagogue. Throughout 1673–74 Hooke had worked closely with Story, "measuring the stonework" on some buildings and inspecting Wren's model for St. Paul's.⁹⁵ Then, on 7 July 1674, Hooke recorded:

Saw Mr. Story who returned from Holland Saturday last. Told me of the new Lutheran church 70 feet diameter and 70 foot over at Amsterdam . . . Of the Jews new Synagogue 100 foot square.—Drank ale with him.⁹⁶

In August Hooke and the master mason frequently met with Wren to discuss the model for St. Paul's. It is possible that Constantijn Huygens was aware of this cross-channel interest in Solomonic masonry, for in September he wrote unusual letters of introduction for Rabbi Leon, who planned to visit London and hoped to meet Huygens's old friends in the Royal Society and Whitehall.

In Huygens's letter to Wren, dated 27 September 1674, he revealed an important Solomonic purpose in Leon's mission:

This bearer is a Jew by birth and profession, and I [am] bound to him for some instruction I had from him, long agoe, in the Hebrew literature. This maketh me grant him the addresses he desireth of me, his intention being to shew in England a curious model of the Temple of Solomon . . . where he doth presume to have demonstrated and corrected an infinite number of errors and paralogismes of our most learned scholars, who had meddled with the exposition of that holy fabric, and most specially of the Jesuit Villalpandus, who, as you know, Sir, has handled the matter *ingenti cum fastu et apparatu, ut solent isti*. I make no question but many of your divines and other virtuosi will take some pleasure to hear the Israelite discourse upon his architecture and the conformity of it with the genuine truth of the holy text, but, Sir, before all, I have thought I was to bring him acquainted with yourself, who are able to judge of the matter upon better and surer grounds than any living man. I give him also letters to the Portigal ambassador, to mylord Arlington and M. Oldenburg that some notice may be taken of him, both at court, and amongst those of the Royal

⁹⁵ R. Hooke, *Diary*, 60,, 66, 73.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 111.

Society. If you will be so good as to direct him unto mylord Archbishop of Canterbury his Grace, even in my name, I am sure the noble prelat will take it *pro more suo* friendly.⁹⁷

In a shorter letter to Arlington, Huygens informed his old friend that Leon would bring his Temple model to London, and he praised Leon's scholarly treatise as an antidote to Villalpando's Jesuit interpretation.⁹⁸ When Huygens further requested that Arlington assist Leon, he was aware that the secretary of state had recently played an important role in ending the Anglo-Dutch war. Long considered a friend to the Jews because of his signature on the 1664 "Declaration of Toleration," Arlington won new Jewish respect when he and Charles II reconfirmed the royal protection in early 1674. Through the Scottish Masonic friends of Huygens, Leon may also have learned of Arlington's Masonic affiliation.

Arlington had earlier collaborated with Moray, whom he praised as one who "passes amongst us as a very understanding Chymical Man," and he was now closely associated with "the Cabal" (the unofficial conclave of Lauderdale, Buckingham, Clifford, and Ashley Cooper) which Charles II used as a secret instrument of government.⁹⁹ Arlington and members of the Cabal maintained friendships with various London Jews, who entertained their wives and daughters at sumptuous dinners.¹⁰⁰ When the Duchess of Buckingham visited Isaac Alvarez, the court jeweller, she contributed towards the synagogue building fund.¹⁰¹ Huygens and Leon may also have heard rumors about the esoteric interests of Arlington's political confidantes.

Crips argues that the clandestine meetings of the Cabal at Ham House, Lauderdale's London residence, constituted a "secret circle, prepared to carry out mystic rites on occasion, if these could further their ambitions and aims."¹⁰² Lauderdale and his wife, the former Lady Dysart, were currently working with Arthur Forbes, a Scottish mason, to enlarge Ham House, and the new ceiling paintings and portraits featured Rosicrucian and Masonic imagery.¹⁰³ In

⁹⁷ A. Shane, "Leon," 157.

⁹⁸ Con. Huygens, *Briefwisseling*, VI, 357.

⁹⁹ Arlington, *Letters*, 450.

¹⁰⁰ R.D. Barnett, "Mr. Pepys' Contacts with the Spanish and Portuguese Jews in London," *TJHSE*, 29 (1986), 31.

¹⁰¹ W. Samuel, "Alvarez," 101.

¹⁰² D. Crips, *Elizabeth*, 80.

¹⁰³ According to J. Clark, "Lord Burlington," 290-93. See also M. Girouard, *Life*,

the duke's private closets, chemist-chemists and mason-mechanics were shown at work, while in the duchess's closet, the Scottish artist William Ferguson portrayed her as "A Sorceress among Classical Ruins," a painting infused with occult symbolism.

Huygens sent another recommendation letter for Leon to Gilbert Sheldon, whom he had met in 1670 when he conferred with Wren and Charles II about various architectural projects.¹⁰⁴ In that year, Sheldon gave his imprimatur for a second edition of Solomon Franco's book, which placed Cabalistic studies within an acceptable Christian framework.¹⁰⁵ Huygens admired the archbishop for his role in rebuilding London after the fire, and he may have been aware of Moray's earlier Masonic correspondence with him. Since Moray's death, however, Sheldon had stopped attending the Royal Society, and he became increasingly rigid in his ecclesiastical policies. Huygens, probably not aware of this change, seemed to assume that his architectural interests and friendship with Moray made him an appropriate host for Rabbi Leon.

Huygens's fourth letter, sent to Oldenburg, would be of more service to the rabbi. A friend and correspondent of Menasseh ben Israel and Benedict Spinoza, Oldenburg would certainly have welcomed Leon. Moreover, he would be able to warn him about royalist hostility to Sabbatianism, for one of Leon's sons had been an ardent supporter of the "false messiah." In Evelyn's exposé of Sabbatai Zevi, he had named an Abraham Leon as a disciple, but there is no evidence that Jacob Jehudah Leon was a sympathizer. Besides Oldenburg's awareness of the sensitivity of the Sabbatian issue in England, he could select Fellows of the Royal Society who would most appreciate Leon's talents and accomplishments.

Huygens's fifth letter went to Don Francesco de Melos, the Portuguese ambassador, who collaborated closely with Arlington in sensitive foreign negotiations.¹⁰⁶ Considered "a special friend" by Queen Catherine, de Melos facilitated contacts between the royal family and Jewish physicians, merchants, and intelligencers. The ambassador could thus facilitate the presentation of Leon to the king

170, and John Cornford and Oliver Hill, *English Country Houses: Caroline (1625-1685)* (London: Country Life, 1966), 71-73.

¹⁰⁴ Con. Huygens, *Briefwisseling*, VI, 275.

¹⁰⁵ Solomon Franco, *Truth Springing Out of the Earth*, 2nd. ed. (1668; London: J. Flesher, 1670).

¹⁰⁶ Arlington, *Letters*, 378, 394.

and queen. In preparation for the journey, Leon prepared a booklet in English, entitled *A Relation of the Most Memorable Things in the Tabernacle of Moses and the Temple of Salomon*, which was printed in Amsterdam in early 1675. Shane notes that with this booklet, Leon achieved three “firsts” in Anglo-Jewish history.

First, the title-page included the royal warrant or coat of arms of the British royal family, thus signifying royal approval and patronage. Second, the text was prefaced by a dedication to Charles II, which was the earliest to a reigning king of England composed by a Jew. In the dedication, Leon used suggestively “Masonic” terms:

... the love of the Divine worship, that imparalel Pietie of your Majestie, known not only to your Brittain, but to all Europe, calls for the Protection, not of the most magnificent structure of this World, but of a building, though made with hands, yet that hath God Himself for the Architect thereof; Vouchsafe, therefore, most Potent Prince . . . to cast a Benign eye upon what is here represented to your Sacred Majestie, it being the Exact form of the Tabernacle, so as it was in the Wilderness, with the struction of Salomon’s Temple, the Holy Vessels, Garments and Utensils . . . The which was graciously owned [acknowledged] with devoute affection 30 years ago and upwards by the Serene Queen, your Majesties Mother . . .¹⁰⁷

Third, a prayer for the prosperity of the king was the first of its kind in English. Comparing the Stuarts to the Israelites in their days of exile, Leon prayed for a long, trouble-free reign and “benigne Clemencie towards us, and to the Israel of God, our brethren under his Dominion.” Though based on the prayer used in the synagogue in Amsterdam, Leon’s text omitted the last words, “and may the Redeemer come into Zion”—probably to avoid any troublesome Sabbatian resonance.

Unfortunately, no records survive of Leon’s experiences in England, but claims were made in the eighteenth century that he actually met Charles II and showed him the models. Moreover, these claims were based on Leon’s papers that were preserved by his descendants and on Jewish oral traditions. The most striking of these traditions is that Leon designed and engraved the coat of arms for the restored Masonic fraternity in England. The claim was first published by Laurence Dermott, a Scots-Irish Mason working in London, who examined

¹⁰⁷ A. Shane, “Leon,” 159.

the family papers in 1759. On the frontispiece of his Masonic treatise, *Ahiman Rezon* (1764), Dermott featured winged cherubim standing over the Ark of the Tabernacle. According to Dermott,

The free masons arms in the upper part of the frontispiece of this book, was found in the collection of the famous and learned Hebrewist, architect, and brother, Rabbi Jacob Jehudah Leon. This gentleman at the request of the states of Holland, built a model of Solomon's temple. The design of this undertaking was to build a temple in Holland, but upon surveying the model it was adjudged that the united provinces of Holland were not rich enough to pay for it; whereupon the States generously bestowed the model upon the builder . . . This model was exhibited at Paris, and Vienna, and afterwards in London, by a patent under the great seal of England, and signed Killigrew in the reign of King Charles the Second . . .

As these were the arms of the masons that built the tabernacle and temple, there is not the least doubt of their being the proper arms of the most ancient and honourable fraternity of free and accepted masons, and the continued practice, formalities, and tradition, in all regular lodges, from the lowest degree to the most high, i.e., the HOLY ROYAL ARCH, confirms the truth thereof.¹⁰⁸

That Thomas Killigrew was a close friend of Constantijn Huygens, who sponsored Leon's mission to England, lends credibility to Dermott's account.¹⁰⁹

Though some English Masonic historians question the veracity of Dermott, member of a Jacobite family and founder of a rival "Antient" system to the "modern" Grand Lodge, there is supporting contemporary evidence in Hooke's diary for Leon's impact on Masonry in London.¹¹⁰ After Hooke listened to Abraham Story, master mason, who recounted in July the design of the synagogue in Amsterdam, he and Story consulted in August with Wren over the proposed designs for St. Paul's.¹¹¹ In November, after Wren had received Huygens's letter about Leon, Hooke bought a book on Dutch architecture. In January 1675 he re-studied Vitruvius and Dee's preface to Euclid. In March he "Propounded paper for masons &c.," which was received by the craftsmen. In May and June he studied Webb's writings on architecture and fortification, and in August he met with

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 146.

¹⁰⁹ Con. Huygens, *Briefwisseling*, V, 245; VI, 273.

¹¹⁰ On Dermott's Jacobite connections, see Sean Murphy, "Irish Jacobitism and Freemasonry," *Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, 9 (1994), 82.

¹¹¹ For the following, see R. Hooke, *Diary*, 111, 116–18, 129, 141 147, 150–51, 156, 165, 176, 179.

Nicholas Young, master mason, “at Young’s shed” (i.e., the *tabernaculum* or temporary lodge erected at a building site). On 6 September Hooke recorded: “With Sir Chr. Wren. Long Discourse with him about the module of the Temple of Jerusalem.” This discussion must have taken place after they visited Leon’s exhibition of his model.

Hooke was obviously preoccupied with Leon’s design and its possible adaptation to the plans for St. Paul’s. On 5 January 1676 he visited Wren and inspected “Morays paper moduls” and “Groves modul of Paules”—the kind of architectural models constructed by master masons.¹¹² Did Moray also build a model of the Temple? As noted earlier, Moray may have met Leon when he and Huygens were pursuing Hebrew studies in Holland in the 1650’s. On 8 January 1676 Hooke acquired Villalpando’s treatise, which Wren and Leon considered inaccurate and anachronistic. Four days later, he discussed the exhibit of “Solomon’s Temple” with Ogilby and other friends. On Friday, 14 January, Hooke tried to re-visit “Solomon’s temple” but “Failld saboth being begun.” This note that the exhibit was closed because of the onset of the Jewish Sabbath proves conclusively that it was Leon’s model that he hoped to re-examine. Ironically, the editor of Hooke’s diary attributes the Temple model to Villalpando, the *bête noire* of Leon and Wren!

Given the context revealed by Hooke’s diary, it becomes plausible that Hooke, Wren, and their Masonic associates considered Leon’s design for a coat of arms appropriate for the “ancient and accepted Freemasons.” It also seems likely that Charles II approved of the design. In another account of Leon’s visit, published in 1788 by the Jewish author David Franco Mendes of Amsterdam, the rabbi was portrayed as an honored guest of the king:

In the year 1675 he [Leon] made his way with the model of the Temple, already mentioned with permission of the above holy congregation and went to London . . . He was received at the King’s palace with honour and showed him the Model of the Temple and the utensils and the King was very glad to see them and hear about their quality and use. He also gave him a letter sealed and signed that permission is given to him alone and no one else to show the work in all the Kingdom . . . Afterwards he returned to the Continent to his work and his burden.¹¹³

¹¹² Ibid., 208–09, 210–11, 179n.

¹¹³ David Franco Mendes, *Ha-measef* [Hebrew] (Berlin-Königsberg, 1788), IV, 297–301; translated in A. Shane, “Leon,” 161.

The king's jeweller Alvarez, who was in charge of the synagogue building project in London, was probably in contact with Leon during the rabbi's visit. Alvarez would soon be gratified when Charles ordered the privy council to pay all debts owed to him.¹¹⁴

Most Jewish scholars see no reason to question the tradition of Leon's Masonic influence in London. Popkin asserts that he addressed Charles II "as if he and the monarch were part of co-equal worlds" and that their meeting was significant for the development of Freemasonry.¹¹⁵ Wolf argues that the Masonic coat of arms "is entirely composed of Jewish symbols" and belongs to "the highest and most mystical domain of Hebrew symbolism"; moreover, it reflects Leon's studies of the mystical Cherubim and fondness for heraldic designs.¹¹⁶ He also reports a version of the rabbi's design painted on a seventeenth-century Masonic panel. Though Leon returned to Holland after his London visit and soon died, one son stayed on in England and continued to exhibit the model over the next decades.

The interest of Hooke and Wren in Leon's work provides a new perspective on the architectural tracts that Wren wrote but did not publish in 1675. In "Of Architecture; and Observations on Antique Temples," he revealed his curiosity about Jewish traditions of architecture and their relevance to national identity and survival:

Architecture has its political use, publick buildings being the ornament of a country . . . The obstinate valour of the Jews, occasioned by the love of their Temple, was a cement that held together that people, for many ages, through infinite changes . . . Architecture aims at eternity.¹¹⁷

Wren argued that "the Tyrian Order" used in Solomon's Temple was "the first Manner" of architecture:

I could wish some skilful Artist would give us the exact dimensions by inches, by which we might have an idea of the Antient Tyrean manner; for it was Solomon by his correspondence with King Hiram employ'd the Tyrean Artists in his Temple . . . What the Architecture was that Solomon used we know little of, though Holy Writ have given us the general dimensions of the Temple, by which we may in some manner collect the Plan but not all the Courts. Villalpandus hath made

¹¹⁴ W. Samuels, "Alvarez," 102.

¹¹⁵ R. Popkin, "Some Aspects," 24.

¹¹⁶ L. Wolf, "Anglo-Jewish Coats of Arms," 156-57.

¹¹⁷ C. Wren, *Parentalia*, 351.

a fine Romantic Piece after the Corinthean Order, which in that age was not used by any Nation.¹¹⁸

He concluded that the craft of architecture was rooted in nature and primeval Hebrew traditions:

The Project of Building is as natural to Mankind as to Birds, and was practised before the Flood. By Josephus we learn that Cain built the first city, Enos, and enclosed it with Wall and Ramparts; and that the Sons of Seth, the other son of Adam, erected two Columns of Brick and Stone to preserve their Mathematical Science to Posterity, so well built that tho ye one of Brick was destroy'd by the Deluge, ye other of Stone was standing in ye time of Josephus.

Hart stresses that Wren drew upon the Solomonic traditions of operative masonry for his Hiram-Tyrean notions: "In Wren's hands legends cultivated by medieval masonry guilds become proof that architecture was a branch not of arcane knowledge but of his own mathematical sciences."¹¹⁹ Through the rationalization of Wren's "modern" mathematical and optical science, Vitruvian design could be merged with Biblical mythology and "certain Renaissance magical theories." Hart also notes that Wren's explications of architectural archetypes and ancient technologies "found a contemporary echo" in Kircher's *Arca Noe* (1675), in which the Jesuit's attempt "to quantify Noah's Ark and the Tower of Babel" was illustrated by elaborate architectural drawings. Perhaps it was Moray who interested Wren in the work of his "epistolar correspondent," for the architect acquired Kircher's *Ars Magna Lucis & Umbrae* (1671) and *Phonurgia Nova* (1673).

Were Wren's tracts, which exist only in rough drafts, designed as lectures to give to Masonic meetings? Hooke had recently "pounded" a paper to a group of masons, and in 1726 a Jacobite partisan of "ancient" Freemasonry would claim that lectures on architecture were regular features of authentic lodge meetings.¹²⁰ An influence from Rabbi Leon on these lectures may have continued for some decades after 1675. His son Solomon Jehudah Leon, who took the surname "Templo," continued to display the Temple model and explanatory treatises, and a document in Wells Cathedral refers

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 360.

¹¹⁹ V. Hart, *St. Paul's*, 9, 24n.25.

¹²⁰ Francis Drake, M.D., speech to a Grand Lodge in York, 27 December 1726; reprinted in Douglas Knoop, G.P. Jones, and Douglas Hamer, eds., *Early Masonic Pamphlets* (1945; London: Q.C. Correspondence Circle, 1978), 196–207.

to this exhibit in 1680. Leon's coat of arms was subsequently adopted by Irish Freemasons, perhaps in the seventeenth century, and later by Irish revisionists in the eighteenth century. Dermott's account of "brother" Leon, published in *Ahiman Rezon*, served his effort to revive "Antient" traditions of Scots-Irish Freemasonry.

Besides the coat of arms, Leon's designs and writings may have influenced Scots-Irish Freemasonry in other ways. In the 1690's, when the Dutch Hebraist Wilhem Surenhuys planned his Latin translation of the *Mishna*, he utilized Leon's papers and designs, which were shown to him by Leon's son.¹²¹ In volume I (1698), Surenhuys praised the scholarship and honesty of Leon *père*, and he dedicated the work to Bishop Narcissus Marsh in Dublin, where many of Leon's publications were acquired for Marsh's Library. In volume VI (1703), Surenhuys dedicated the volume to Robert Harley, son of Moray's friend Edward, who was praised as an "honest Mason" by the Duke of Hamilton. The persistence of Leon's influence is further suggested by the striking similarities between his designs in Surenhuys's edition and those on eighteenth-century Masonic tracing boards.¹²²

With the end of the Dutch war in 1674, England's public alliance with France also came to an end. The Cabal, which had erratically supported the war, fell apart when the diplomatic situation shifted. The king and his brother continued to carry on secret dealings with Louis XIV, while in Scotland royalists urged the continuation of the "auld alliance." William Bruce, now praised as the "Inigo Jones of Scotland," especially admired French culture, and he was currently introducing many French features into the king's and Lauderdale's palaces. The ever vigilant Samuel Butler perceived England's flirtation with France as part of an insidious Scottish plot. As with radical Rosicrucianism, Butler linked "Our Ridiculous Imitation of the French" to stubborn Presbyterian traditions in Scotland:

Presbytery is but a Religion of the French Fashion, as the greatest of all our vanities and Follies are . . . and it came to us from Scotland which has in all ages Correspondence with France against England.¹²³

¹²¹ Guilielmus Surenhusius, *Mischna* (Amsterdam: Borstius, 1698–1703), I, preface; V, frontispiece, 322–23. He also thanked the late Jacob Abendana for "having made available his Spanish translation of that great work" (which has since disappeared); see D. Katz, "Abendana," 47.

¹²² See J. Curl, *Art and Architecture*, 89.

¹²³ S. Butler, *Satires*, 162, 216.

Inspired by Butler's satires on the Royal Society, which circulated in manuscript in 1675, Thomas Shadwell wrote *The Virtuoso*, which was performed by the Duke's Company in May 1676. For this comical satire on the Fellows, Shadwell featured a would-be Scottish virtuoso, Sir Tom Bruce, who spouts a Frenchified version of Epicurean "scientific" philosophy, though he rejects the current craze for French fashions and idioms. Shadwell may have based Bruce on the late Robert Moray, a Scottish F.R.S., who combined French learning with frugal living, or he may have targeted Moray's confidante Alexander Bruce, F.R.S. When Sir Tom Bruce and his friend Longvil woo Clarinda and Miranda, they must win over the ladies' eccentric uncle Sir Nicholas Gimcrack, "the Virtuoso," who like the internationalists Moray and Oldenburg is "beholden to Finland, Lapland, and Russia" for a great part of his philosophy.¹²⁴

Advised by a master, Gimcrack is currently learning to swim without water. As Lady Gimcrack informs Bruce, "he is a rare machanic philosopher. The College indeed refus'd him. They envied him." She then shows Sir Gimcrack learning to swim upon a table:

He has a frog in a bowl of water, tied with a packthread by the loins, which packthread Sir Nicholas holds in his teeth, lying upon his belly on a table; as the frog strikes, he strikes, and his swimming master stands by to tell him when he does well or ill.¹²⁵

Sir Gimcrack boasts to Bruce, "I content myself with the speculative part of swimming; I care not for the practic. I seldom bring anything to use."¹²⁶ When he isn't swimming through the air, he spends days and nights observing the anus of an ant, which leads Bruce to conclude that "one bricklayer is worth forty philosophers."

Amidst his giddy plot, which included a prostitute "virtuosa," Shadwell revived earlier charges of a connection of Rosicrucianism to radical Protestantism. Echoing *Hudibras*, Gimcrack boasts:

I am much skill'd in Rosicrucian learning. I am one of the vere adepts as simple as I stand here. I discover'd it by my sight having familiar conversations with spirits . . . You converse with a great many spirits which you take for men and women, but we Rosicrucians know'em to be spirits. Now let us go to my sick people and administer.¹²⁷

¹²⁴ Thomas Shadwell, *The Virtuoso*, ed. Marjorie Nicolson and David Rodes (Lincoln: Nebraska UP, 1966), 73.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 43.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 47, 69, 102.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 106.

Gimcrack's ant research proves that "They have the best government in the world," a commonwealth or Dutch republic. Bruce observes that "No fanatic that has lost his wits in revelation is so mad as this fool," but Longvil replies, "You are mistaken. This is but a faint copy to some originals among the tribe."

When the ribbon weavers charge Gimcrack with the invention of an engine loom that will replace their handicraft, he swears that he never invented anything useful. When the weavers' "rabble" becomes violent, another useless aristocrat Sir Formal warns them in Latin "Quare fremuerunt gentes—." Was it merely coincidental that the quote, taken from Psalm 2, repeats that given in Hebrew on the royalist Treloar Masonic MS.—"Why do the heathen rage and the people consider a vain thing?" Underneath Shadwell's comic tone is a more ominous sense that elitist advocates of the Royal Society, Rosicrucianism, and (perhaps) Masonry were irresponsibly stoking the fires of sedition and rebellion.

Impelled by his disgust with the present leadership of the Royal Society and his annoyance at the public ridicule, Robert Hooke organized a secretive new club for selected Fellows, who included "natural philosophers" and "mechanics." The first meeting was at Wren's house on 1 January 1676, and Hooke recorded happily: "We now began our New Philosophicall Club, and Resolv'd upon Ingaging ourselves not to speak of any thing that was then reveal'd *sub sigillo* to any one nor to declare that we had such a meeting at all."¹²⁸ As Hooke's faction labored to regain the respect of the king and convince him to play a more activist role as patron of the Royal Society, they must have worried when Charles enjoyed a performance of *The Virtuoso* on 25 May 1676. One month later, Lady Cutler asked Hooke about the play, which he subsequently attended on 1 July. In the face of Shadwell's mockery of Frenchified virtuosos, a defiant Hooke resolved to visit France.

At this time, Hooke was so fed up with Oldenburg and his "Grubendolian Caball" that he worked harder to develop his "new Decimall Society . . . for chemistry, anatomy, astronomy and opticks, mathematics and mechanicks." Hooke's distrust of Oldenburg was shared by Wren, who charged the secretary of the Royal Society "with Disingenuity, and Breach of Trust," for communicating and clandestinely conveying "into foreign parts . . . divers of the Inventions,

¹²⁸ R. Hooke, *Diary*, 205–06, 238–44; B. Little, *Wren*, 110–11.

and original experiments” produced by Wren.¹²⁹ Even worse, Oldenburg deliberately failed to enter Wren’s achievements in the society’s register. Hooke’s and Wren’s frustration may have led them to consider a secretive Rosicrucian- or Masonic-style society that would welcome trusted virtuosos and craftsmen.

With his usual laconic style, Hooke noted on 14 July, “At Honiwood view with Mr. Aubery to whom I spoke of Rosicrusian club. He named tongue.”¹³⁰ It is unclear whether Hooke was worried about the existence of a Rosicrucian society run by Ezerel Tonge, or whether he wanted to recruit Tonge to a new Rosicrucian club. Though Tonge was not an F.R.S., he had contributed papers to the society and collaborated on chemical experiments with Moray. Hooke earlier recorded his own meeting with “Dr. Tongue, Oldenburg, and Waters”—the latter a master mason who frequently worked and socialized with Hooke. On 23 July Hooke recorded a conversation with “Dr. Johnson about philosophers stone, about universal Language,” and he subsequently acquired Johnson’s “chimicall dictionary.” As critics linked the Royal Society to foreign-affiliated Rosicrucianism, Hooke not only vowed to leave the society (on 8 October 1676) but explored further the possibilities of a secret club independent of the society. It is possible that he utilized his Masonic associations for some kind of Rosicrucian purpose.

Throughout 1676–77 Hooke’s main employment was in the architectural field, and he collaborated regularly with Wren and Evelyn. He studied Vitruvius, Palladio, and contemporary Continental works on architecture, including a French book “of masonry,” while he consulted with operative masons and participated in masonic ceremonies.¹³¹ On 3 April 1676 he recorded his presence when “St. Albans Cornerstone layd,” and on 3 March 1677 he and Abraham Story, master mason, dined with St. Albans at his residence. Hooke was probably aware that St. Albans had earlier served as Grand Master. On 13 April, while working on the new building for the College of Physicians, Hooke spoke of a projected “club for chymistry and anatomy”—a major focus of Rosicrucian-minded virtuosos. Determined to secure secrecy and loyalty among his cadre of sci-

¹²⁹ C. Wren, *Parentalia*, 199, 247.

¹³⁰ Michael Hunter, *John Aubrey and the Realm of Learning* (London: Gerard Duckworth, 1975), 139; R. Hooke, *Diary*, 242, 135, 524, 243.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 250, 257, 262, 270, 287; also, 224, 285, 288, 291.

entists and craftsmen, Hooke now studied Dee's mathematical works and inspected Ashmole's collection of Dee manuscripts on Cabalistic angel magic and cryptography.

Thus, it is not surprising that the public perceived a linkage between the virtuosos, Freemasons, and Rosicrucians, as revealed by a curious article in *Poor Robin's Intelligencer* (10 October 1676):

Divertissements: These are to give notice, that the Modern Green-ribbon Caball, together with the Ancient Brotherhood of the Rosy Cross; the Hermetick Adepti; and the Company of Accepted Masons, intende all to dine together on the 31 of November . . . having already given order for great store of Black-swan Pies, Poach'd Phoenix's Eggs, Haunches of Unicorns, etc. To be provided on that occasion; All idle people that can spare so much time from the Cone-house, may prepare to be spectators of the Solemnity: But are advised to provide themselves Spectacles of Malleable Glass; for otherwise 'tis thought the said Societies will (as hitherto) make their Appearance Invisible.

The linkage of Masons and Rosicrucians to the "modern Green-ribbon Caball" was particularly worrisome, for the author referred to the Green Ribbon Club—a semi-secret, anti-Catholic, Whig society—which opposed James's right to succeed to the throne.¹³² The author evidently perceived or invented similarities between the arcane rituals of the three groups. In reality, when Green Ribbon Club members dressed as priests and performed symbolic Pope burnings, their rituals were diametrically opposed to those of royalist Masons and pacific Rosicrucians.

On 23 March 1677 another article in *Poor Robin's Intelligencer* linked the Rosicrucians with Jewish Cabalists and Dutch republicans:

Our old Polonian Quack . . . is lately discover'd transmogrified by the Magick of Algazel Alpharabins Rabbi Jetzirah Onkelus the Pythagorean Cabalist and Philo the Jew, into Mijn Heer Hooger Prisjen Beweyson Grand Empirick of Low-Dutchland . . . [and] His brother Doctoribus Rotterdamable.

The anonymous writer was perhaps aware of the impact of the Leon family, father and son, on London virtuosos and Masons, which occurred within a context of Cabalistic revival among Christian Hebraists and their Jewish associates.

Since 1663 Jacob and Isaac Abendana had eked out a living at

¹³² Michael Baigent, "Freemasonry, Hermetic Thought, and the Royal Society of London," *AQC*, 109 (1996), 158.

Cambridge and Oxford, where they taught and sold Hebrew and Cabalistic manuscripts and books. However, they were disappointed in Oldenburg and other professed philo-Semites, who did not fulfill their promised purchases.¹³³ In 1672 Isaac received a more encouraging response from Henry More, who hosted Isaac, Edmund Castell (Cambridge professor of Hebrew), and Johannes Gezelius (Swedish Orientalist) in a discussion of the Cabalistic translation project of F.M. van Helmont and Knorr von Rosenroth. More read to his guests Rosenroth's letter, in which he credited Isaac Luria's commentary on the *Zohar* as important to his understanding of the Cabalistic text. Isaac Abendana then assured More that the Jews considered Luria to be "the most knowing man of their cabbala of the Jewes Nation."¹³⁴ It is possible that More informed Moray about the Cabalistic project, for the two men were close friends in 1672. More and Van Helmont contributed essays to Rosenroth's *Kabbala Denudata* (1677), which made available to Christian scholars Latin texts of the *Sepher Yetzirah*, *Zohar*, and Lurianic commentaries. While Van Helmont worked on the project, he visited the Royal Society, which perhaps spurred Hooke's interest in Jewish mysticism. On 26 May 1677 Hooke recorded his readings in More's *Cabala* and "a tract of mosaicall philosophy," evidently by Fludd.

At this time, the Jewish community undertook new defensive measures to reinforce their protection under the king. As Parliament rejected Charles II's attempts to implement full religious toleration, the Jews feared that their position could become as restricted as that of Catholics. Thus, in 1677, when Jewish leaders revised their *ascamoth*, or regulations for the government of the congregation, they included a copy of Charles's 1664 letter promising toleration.¹³⁵ The royal letter reinforced the determination of the *Mahamad*, the governing council, to preserve unity and avoid "causing scandal to the natives of this city." The Jews also began an annual tradition of presenting the Lord Mayor of London with a valuable silver dish of sweetmeats.

Despite these precautions taken by the Jewish community, *Poor Robin's Intelligencer* now linked Jewish Cabalists with Scottish Covenanters and Hermetic virtuosos. On 27 March the journal proclaimed, "There

¹³³ H. Oldenburg, *Correspondence*, IV, 121, 145–46.

¹³⁴ Anne Conway, *Conway Letters*, ed. Marjorie Nicholson (New Haven: Yale UP, 1930), 350–52, 358, 373. Identification of Gezelius by Susanna Akerman.

¹³⁵ D. Katz, *Jews in History*, 144.

is lately privately publisht, The Solemn League and Covenant of Tally-mongers, petty Usurers . . . that every Mothers Child respectively shall be as errant Jews as the rest." On 15 May, in a new attack, the journal seemed to target Isaac Abendana, Hebrew instructor at Cambridge, and his friends among the Cambridge Platonists:

Rabbi Alpharabius Onkelos, otherwise called Philo-Asso, the Wandering Jew having taken up his residence in the famous University called by Pythagorean Cabalists, or Rogues Arabick, the Whit, but vulgarly Newgate.

The satire may have taken its toll, for Abendana left the university that year, "in less than friendly circumstances."¹³⁶ On 25 July *Poor Robin* mocked the virtuosos for their "Magical Talismans against fleas" and their "Hermetic learning," which provides a "never failing Secret against these Nocturnal Disturbances."

On 6 September Hooke recorded with grim satisfaction the death of Oldenburg, whose "Grubendolian Caball" could no longer trouble him. However, Hooke did not abandon the occult studies which so fascinated Oldenburg, for he undertook a more extensive reading of Hermetic and Cabalistic writings. In 1678–79 Hooke read and discussed Paracelsus's *Epitome*, Bacon's *New Atlantis*, Spinoza's *Philosophia*, Addison's *State of the Jews*, Davy's *Hebrew Grammar*, Hartlib's chemical correspondence and, most provocatively, *Le Comte de Gabalis*.¹³⁷ The latter was published at Paris in 1670 by the Abbé de Montfaucon de Villars, who based its Rosicrucian theories on the purloined alchemical letters of Borri, whose work had earlier interested Moray and his Hermetic colleagues in the Royal Society. The novella was sub-titled "Discourses on the Secret Sciences and Mysteries, in accordance with Principles of the Ancient Magi and the Wisdom of the Cabalistic Phillosophers," and its frontispiece featured an inscription from Tertullian that warned: "When a thing is hidden away with so much pains merely to reveal it is to destroy it."¹³⁸

On 16 September 1678 Hooke recorded his conversation at Jonathan's coffee house about the theories of Schroder (alchemist and F.R.S.), Clodius (alchemist and son-in-law of Hartlib), and *Le*

¹³⁶ D. Katz, "Abendana Brothers," 40. He returned to Cambridge in March 1669.

¹³⁷ R. Hooke, *Diary*, 308, 310, 351, 361, 377, 394, 396.

¹³⁸ Abbé de Montfaucon de Villars, *Comte de Gabalis* (1670; London: William Rider, 1922).

Comte de Gabalis.¹³⁹ In the Rosicrucian novella, the narrator recounts the recent death of Gabalis, who was struck with apoplexy after revealing the secrets of Cabala: “since the Blessed Raymond Lully so decreed in his testament, an avenging angel has never failed promptly to wring the necks of all who have indiscreetly revealed the Philosophic mysteries.”¹⁴⁰ At this time, rumors circulated that the Abbé de Villars had been assassinated in 1673, in order to prevent him from publishing his promised sequel to *Gabalis*. Hooke, who was obsessed with secrecy and feared spies around him, perhaps identified with the author and hero, especially after he received a letter threatening his life, which had been intercepted by the Customs Office in October.¹⁴¹ While he pondered ways of reorganizing the Royal Society and considered alternative secret clubs, the *Comte de Gabalis* must have seemed oddly relevant to his concerns.

Villars published the novella in a Parisian context of rumors about Descartes’s association with the Rosicrucians and of academic battles between believers and non-believers in a spirit world. Though the narrator professes himself a sceptic, whose “common sense” made him suspect “the existence of much claptrap in all the so-called Occult Sciences,” he was impressed and frightened by the revelations of Gabalis, a German aristocrat from Poland, who visited France in route to England. Before meeting with his mystical brotherhood in Paris, Gabalis offered to initiate the narrator into the secrets of Cabalistic science in a ceremony to be held in the labyrinth of Richelieu’s great garden at Ruel. Drawing on Paracelsus, Postel, Cardano, Dornaeo, Fludd, and other purported Rosicrucians, Gabalis urges the young man to “render yourself worthy to receive the Cabalistic Light, my Son, the hour of your regeneration is at hand.”¹⁴² Through use of magical crystals, mirrors, and magnets, the initiate can learn to communicate—both spiritually and physically—with his celestial partner.

Under God, “the Most Wise Craftsman,” the universe is filled with intermediary spirits—Gnomes, Sylphs, Salamanders, and Undines—who become immortalized through sacramental sexual intercourse with human sages or members of the Cabalistic order. In order to

¹³⁹ R. Hooke, *Diary*, 377.

¹⁴⁰ M. de Villars, *Gabalis*, 1.

¹⁴¹ R. Hooke, *Diary*, 382.

¹⁴² M. de Villars, *Gabalis*, 17.

achieve this communion, the adept must renounce all sensual relations with women. Giving titillating hints at the psychoerotic bliss that adepts can achieve through proper meditation upon the magical names of God, Gabalis promised mental tranquility and emotional serenity—the kind of stoic or nirvanic state achieved by Moray through similar meditation. More relevant to Hooke, perhaps, was Gabalis's claim that Cabala provided a scientific key to the secrets of natural philosophy:

The Cabalist acts solely according to the principles of Nature; and if strange words, symbols, and circumlocutions are sometimes found in our books, they are only used to conceal the principles of Natural Philosophy from the ignorant. Admire the simplicity of nature in all her marvellous works! And in this simplicity a harmony and concert so great, so exact, and so essential that it will compel you, in spite of yourself, to relinquish your idle fancies. What I am about to tell you, we teach those of our disciples whom we are not willing unreservedly to admit into the Sanctuary of Nature . . .¹⁴³

The unmarried Hooke, who regularly recorded in code his own copulations with servants, must have been intrigued by hints at the sexual bliss awaiting the adept, whose “heteroclitic organ” would “delight in the most igneous places.” Alas, that ultimate secret of the Sanctuary was not given by Gabalis, who (with his author) died before volume II could be published.

While Hooke explored these Hermetic and Rosicrucian writings, he was involved almost daily with master masons. He directed the masons working at St. Paul's, and he loaned a book and compass to one mason. His recorded purchases of gloves were probably gifts to be used during initiations, as required by the craft constitutions.¹⁴⁴ It was perhaps this immersion in masonic lore—as well as Gabalis's praise of Lull—that stimulated Hooke's interest in the Art of Memory. In November he purchased and inscribed John Willis's *Variorum de Arte Memoria* (1678), which included a section on the Admirable Crichton and inspired Hooke to read Thomas Urquhart's panegyric to the famous Scottish “Master of Memory.”¹⁴⁵ As noted earlier, Urquhart also discussed the Mason's Word, connecting it with the

¹⁴³ Ibid., 46–47.

¹⁴⁴ R. Hooke, *Diary*, 352, 357, 371, 421, 440.

¹⁴⁵ Hooke's copy of Urquhart is in the National Library of Scotland; see also his *Diary*, 384, 411.

practice of beneficial natural magic. In Willis's 1678 edition, a section was added on hand movements and finger signals, that could function as mnemonic and identification aids—like the “signs and tokens” of the Freemasons. In 1679 Hooke acquired Matheoli's *Memoria* and Lull's *Ars Magna*.

In the wake of Oldenburg's death, there was much “cavilling and caballing” in the Royal Society, while Hooke and his faction successfully engineered the removal of Lord Brouncker, the Irish mathematician who had been president for fifteen years. In November Joseph Williamson, secretary of state, was elected president, Wren vice-president, and Hooke co-secretary. The Fellows hoped Williamson's favor with the king would bolster the position of the society, which was once again the target of ridicule. On 9 November 1677 Hooke noted “Hudebras 3rd part,” which Butler published in 1678.¹⁴⁶ Just as A.B. had warned, the public now hooted at the Fellows as witches. Focusing his satire on the revival of chivalry (*à la* Ashmole's Garter history) and royalist astrology (Ashmole's advisory role to the king about handling Parliament), Butler attacked Hudibras's continuing fascination with Sidrophel the Rosicrucian, who promises to,

Make Leachers and their Punks with Dewtry
Commit phantastical Advowtry;
Bewitch Hermetick-men to run
Stark staring mad with Manicon;
Believe Mechanick Virtuosi
Can raise 'em Mountains in Potosi;
And sillier than the Antick Fools,
Take Treasure from a Heap of Coals;
Seek out for Plants with Signatures,
To Quack of Universal Cures

.....

To draw in Fools, whose Nat'ral Itches
Incline perpetually to Witches . . .¹⁴⁷

Butler worried that radicals were once again utilizing prophetic visions to disturb the state. Thus, Sidrophel employs new magical techniques that he learned from Swedish contacts:

He therefore sent out all his Senses,
To bring him in Intelligences.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 327.

¹⁴⁷ S. Butler, *Hudibras*, 205–06.

Which Vulgars out of ignorance
 Mistake, for falling in a trance:
 But those that trade in Geomancy,
 Affirm to be the strength of Fancy:
 In which the Lapland-Magi deal,
 And things incredible reveal.¹⁴⁸

At this time, Hooke acquired *Lapland*, by the Swedish savant Johan Scheffer, who recounted the magical and visionary techniques of the Lapps, and he and Ashmole maintained contact with visiting Swedish virtuosos—several of whom became Fellows of the Royal Society.¹⁴⁹

Butler's mockery of virtuoso contacts with Scandinavia touches lightly on a growing collaboration between the Stuart and Swedish kings that would endure throughout the eighteenth century, despite occasional partisan breaks. Moreover, that collaboration would have an important Masonic component. In 1678 a new "Masonic" link with Sweden was established, when the brilliant Swedish architect Nicodemus Tessin visited London, where he met Wren and Charles II, who asked to see his designs; the king then invited Tessin to enter his service.¹⁵⁰ Wren may have learned that he was a kinsman of Hans Ewald Tessin, the Edinburgh Freemason who now worked on the Mole at Tangier. Nicodemus possibly joined a lodge in London, for his son Carl Gustaf Tessin said his father was proud to call himself a "Master Mason."¹⁵¹ The architect's great interest in Ashmole's Order of the Garter influenced his son's devotion to chivalric traditions, which Carl Gustaf later infused into *Écossais* Masonic rites in Sweden. Though Nicodemus did not accept Charles II's offer and instead moved on to study architecture at the courts of Christina in Rome and Louis XIV in Paris, he and his descendants would remain loyal to the Stuart cause during the long decades of exile that lay ahead.

In *Hudibras* III, Butler scorned the credulity that allowed the

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 226.

¹⁴⁹ R. Hooke, *Diary*, 374, 379, 389–90; E. Josten, *Ashmole*, I, 257; IV, 1724–25, 1732.

¹⁵⁰ Osvald Siren, *Nicodemus Tessin D.Y:s Studieresor* (Stockholm: Norstedt, 1914), vi, 6.

¹⁵¹ Duc de Luynes, *Mémoires du Duc de Luynes sur la Cour de Louis XV* (Paris: Firmin didot, 1860), XII, 113–14. For Tessin and Jacobite Freemasonry, see M.K. Schuchard, "The Young Pretender and Jacobite Freemasonry: New Light from Sweden on His Role as 'Hidden Grand Master,'" *Consortium on Revolutionary Europe, 1750–1850: Selected Papers 1994*, ed. Ronald Caldwell (Tallahassee: Florida State UP, 1994), 363–72.

Rosicrucian-Laplandish scientists to seduce disciples, while he reduced their natural magic to mere superstition:

Who would believe what strange Bugbears
Mankind creates it self, of Fears?
.....

For fear does things so like a Witch,
'Tis hard t'unriddle which is which.
Sets up Communities of Senses,
To chop and change Intelligences:
As Rosi-crucian Virtuosos,
Can see with Ears and Hear with Noses:
And when they neither see nor hear,
Have more than both suppli'd by Fear;
That makes 'em in the dark see Visions,
And hag themselves with Apparitions.¹⁵²

Butler's new attack occurred in a volatile political context, for in August 1678 the Rosicrucian Ezerel Tonge revealed to the king an alleged "Popish Plot," in which manipulative Jesuits and their Catholic dupes planned to assassinate Charles II and Ormonde and to raise a rebellion in all three kingdoms.¹⁵³ The eccentric Tonge gained access to the king through the latter's interest in alchemy. Since 1670 he had also fueled Evelyn's growing fear of Jesuitism by translating French diatribes against the order for his increasingly gullible friend.¹⁵⁴ On 27 September Tonge's charges were reinforced by his collaborator Titus Oates, who described to a Justice of the Peace an even vaster conspiracy. One day later, an amused Charles, who did not take the trumped-up charges seriously, blithely asked the Privy Council to examine Tonge's documents. Oates also testified and published his sensational case, which led a disconcerted Hooke to record, "Heard of Popish Plot Discovered."¹⁵⁵

Like Tonge, Oates had served in Tangier (in 1677), where he observed the "ambitious scheme of improvement," which included the enlargement of the castle and fortifications and the near-completion of the great Mole.¹⁵⁶ Dismissed from his position as chaplain to the garrison because of homosexual behavior, he moved to Spain,

¹⁵² S. Butler, *Hudibras*, 283–84.

¹⁵³ R. Hutton, *Charles II*, 358–62.

¹⁵⁴ J. Evelyn, *Miscellaneous*, 500.

¹⁵⁵ R. Hooke, *Diary*, 379.

¹⁵⁶ Jane Lane, *Titus Oates* (London: Andrew Dakers, 1949), 31, 41, 50, 92, 166.

converted to Catholicism, and studied to become a Jesuit.¹⁵⁷ When the Jesuits rejected his application, he returned to London bent on revenge. His Tangier memories of the cooperation of Scots-Irish masons and soldiers with Jewish, Moslem, and Portuguese colleagues fueled his paranoid vision of a giant Presbyterian-Jesuit conspiracy in Scotland, to be backed by a French invasion of Ireland. He accused the Jesuits of learning their techniques from the Hebrews, but the brothers "By horrid, worse than Jewish interest" now plan to transport money and trade out of England.¹⁵⁸ Oates's inflammatory pamphlets were published by order of Parliament, and he was made an honorary member of the Green Ribbon Club.

The situation changed from comical to dangerous when "a disbelieving King faced an all too credulous Parliament."¹⁵⁹ Taking advantage of public panic, Parliament imposed rigid restrictions on Catholics, ordered searches of homes for incriminating papers, and attempted to remove the Duke of York from his official positions. On 18 November the secretary of state Williamson was sent to the Tower because of his effort to employ Irish regiments released from French service. For the virtuosos who elected Williamson to the presidency of the Royal Society, it must have seemed as if the anti-Catholic mania would seriously damage their efforts at reform.

Charles believed that Buckingham and Shaftesbury, now allied with the opposition Whigs in Parliament, instigated the actions of Tonge and Oates in order to exclude the Catholic James from the succession. Butler, who was privy to Buckingham's intrigues, added to the political hysteria with his charges of Franco-Scottish-Jewish sedition in *Hudibras* III, which was reprinted in 1679. Because Francophilia makes marriage unfashionable (a dig at promiscuous courtiers and the profusion of royal bastards), Hudibras and the Scots now serve the cause of Papist agents: "your Presbyterian wits/ Jump punctual with the Jesuits."¹⁶⁰ While Hooke and the Rosicrucianized virtuosos work with Napier's Bones, they implicitly support the Scots and Catholics.¹⁶¹ While they study Kircher's works, they not only support the Jesuits but the Jews:

¹⁵⁷ Eveline Cruickshanks, *The Glorious Revolution* (London: Macmillan, 2000), 8.

¹⁵⁸ Titus Oates, *A True Narrative of the Horrid Plot and Conspiracy of the Popish Party* (Dublin, 1679), 40.

¹⁵⁹ R. Hutton, *Charles II*, 361.

¹⁶⁰ S. Butler, *Hudibras*, 210, 214.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 250; compare R. Hooke, *Diary*, 231, 331.

But Jesuites have deeper Reaches
 In all their Politick Far-fetches:
 And from their Coptick Priest, Kirkerus,
 Found out this Mystick way to jear us.

They thought, all Governments were best,
 By Hieroglyphick Rumps, exprest.

The Learned Rabbins of the Jews
 Write, there's a Bone, which they call Luez,
 I' th' Rump of man, of such a Vertue,
 No force in Nature can do hurt to;
 And therefore, at the last Great Day,
 All th' other Members shall, they say,
 Spring out of this, as from a Seed,
 All sorts of Vegetals proceed:
 From whence, the Learned Sons of Art,
Os Sacrum, justly stile that part.¹⁶²

The Cabalistic theory of the mystical bone Luz was explained in the *Kabbalah Denudata*, which was currently being discussed by various Fellows of the Royal Society. In a letter of 6 June 1679 John Locke, FRS, who had earlier studied under the Rosicrucian Sthael, noted that Robert Boyle informed him of the publication of the *Zohar*, newly translated into Latin by “un tres habil homme avec des notes qui expliquent l'ancien Cabala des Juifs.”¹⁶³ Locke was interested in Helmontian theories of medicine, and he subsequently learned of F.M. Van Helmont's contribution to the *Kabbalah Denudata*, which he then acquired. Rosenroth later sent to Locke interesting Cabalistic commentaries on the philosopher's essays. In his letter to Boyle, Locke also revealed that Isaac Abendana “s'est brouillé” with the authorities at Cambridge and thus took his *Mishna* project to Oxford. Rosenroth later complained of the harsh treatment he received from many clerics in Germany because of his publication of *Kabbalah Denudata*, and Helmont found the climate in England becoming increasingly intolerant.

With the country reeling from the sensational revelations of the phony “Popish Plot,” the Whigs rummaged through Tonge's chaotic

¹⁶² Ibid., 280–81; compare R. Hooke, *Diary*, 331, 336, 377.

¹⁶³ John Locke, *Correspondence of John Locke*, ed. E.S. de Beer (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), II, 30; II, 399–404.

papers for more evidence of the Catholic conspiracy. For decades Tonge had collected occultist prophecies which he applied to imagined Jesuitical intrigues and which he now resolved to publish. Writing furiously in late 1679, Tonge prepared *The Northern Star: The British Monarchy*, dedicated to Charles II and published early in 1680. Drawing on Abbot Joachim, Paracelsus, Agrippa, Reuchlin, Postel, Nostradamus, Napier, Sendivogius, and Maxwell, Tonge assured Charles II of his prophetic role as the northern king who would settle God's Temple in the North Country. In Chapter IV, entitled "The Confession of the Rosie-Cross," he linked Charles with the God-Son C.R. who founded the R.C. society. He further assured him of scientific support, for the secretary of the Royal Society (Oldenburg) had received similar prophecies in 1668. Ocular proof was currently provided by the German visionary Martin Eyler, who was in London with his agate shew-stone in which spiritual figures revealed political prophecies.

According to Tonge, the only obstacle to Charles's role as Rosicrucian savior of international Protestantism was the nefarious plot of the Jesuits, who had learned from the "Assassins of Phoenecia" how to train adepts for their campaign. Because Tonge's bizarre linkage of Jesuits and Assassins would re-emerge in anti-Masonic propaganda in the eighteenth century, it is worth a brief look at his fevered argument. In *Jesuits Assassins: or the Popish Plot Further Declared* (1680), he made oblique Masonic-sounding comments. The sect of Assassins lived in the mountains near Tyre, where their Master was "not hereditary but elected."¹⁶⁴ Called the "Old Man of the Mountain," this prophet was a great builder, who designed wonderful palaces adorned with pictures. By intoxicating his disciples with a certain drink (hashish), he gave them a glimpse of paradise which inspired them to swear obedience to the Master, loyalty to their brothers, and death to their enemies. Having studied the Assassins, the Jesuits then adopted their methods in order to destroy Protestantism.

Rather than giving their agents hashish, the Jesuits used charms and exorcisms, performed in "Chambers of Meditation and other Recesses of Darkness": they "conjured up gradually to that prodigious fury, as to think that in bloody assassinations of Kings and Princes, and merciless blowing up of Kingdoms, they do acceptable

¹⁶⁴ Ezerel Tonge, *Jesuits Assassins: or the Popish Plot Further Declared* (London: J. Darley, 1680), 4-9.

service to God, and merit everlasting Life.” Through their magical meditation techniques, the Jesuit agents become angelized and divinized to prepare for their deadly work. Quoting the Spanish Jesuit Vaninus, Tonge interpreted his description of a brother who was sent to London, where he labored forty-nine days “in cutting stones,” as an allusion to the Gun Powder Plot to blow up “the Walls under the Parliament House.” Such false stone-cutters then arranged the murder of Charles I and the Great Fire of London.

Through his earlier work on church construction and his collaboration with Moray, Hooke, Harley, and various master masons, Tonge was familiar with operative masonry. Oates too had observed the masons at work in Tangier. However, it is unclear whether their paranoid polemics were consciously aimed at royalist Freemasonry. Nevertheless, the scare engendered by their revelations placed not only Masons but Rosicrucians and Cabalists in a hazardous position. That Buckingham, whom the king believed to be the inventor of the Popish Plot, allegedly served as an “indolent” Grand Master in 1679 gave an ironic twist to Tonge’s revelations.¹⁶⁵ Probably pressured by an angry Charles II, Buckingham “demitted” from the office. He was replaced by his rival, the ever loyal Arlington, who however “was too deeply engag’d in affairs of State to mind the Lodges.”

Nevertheless, Arlington continued to represent the tolerant traditions of Stuart Freemasonry, for he was sympathetic to Catholics and Jews, as well as being a great admirer of Spanish and French architecture—subjects which filled Tonge with iconoclastic disgust. Evelyn considered Arlington a learned and pious man, who devoted his architectural skills to God’s service. Two years earlier, Evelyn praised Arlington for rebuilding the church at Euston, making it “for elegance and cheerfulness . . . one of the prettiest country churches in England,” and he was moved by Arlington’s motives in the project:

My Lord told me his heart smote him that, after he had bestowed so much on his magnificent palace there, he should see God’s House in the ruin it lay in. He has also re-built the parsonage-house, all of stone, very neat and ample.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶⁵ J. Anderson, *Constitutions* (1738), 105.

¹⁶⁶ J. Evelyn, *Diary*, IV, 114.

Though Anderson claimed that during Arlington's Grand Mastership, "the Fraternity was considerable still, and many Gentlemen requested to be admitted," there is no surviving evidence of developments in "speculative" Freemasonry in England over the next two decades. Stevenson observes that "English gentlemen non-operatives were not organised into lodges with set memberships of a Scottish or modern kind, but met in fluid occasional lodges" connected with building sites.¹⁶⁷ However, when Charles sent his embattled brother James to Scotland in November 1679, the duke's intermittent presence over the next thirty months encouraged a revival of royalist Masonry in the north. In this political context lay the roots of the later development of Jacobite Freemasonry, when Scottish and Irish Masons loyal to James VII and II took their "ancient" traditions into exile with their banished king.

Ouston argues that the king sent the Duke of York to Scotland to keep him out of the way of an English Commons inflamed by the Popish Plot and to enable him to develop an alternative political power base.¹⁶⁸ During his previous "exile" to the Continent from May to August 1679, James appreciated the generous support of Kincardine, whom he in turn consoled when the earl had problems with Lauderdale.¹⁶⁹ Kincardine now served as an Extraordinary Lord of Session, and he was instrumental in bringing factions together to welcome James to Edinburgh. From London Lauderdale helped to organize the loyal reception, and the heir apparent was greeted warmly by the aristocratic and professional classes. The latter had become fearful of civil war after the murder of Archbishop Sharp by radical Presbyterians in May, followed by an armed rising of Covenanters in June. Despite James's Catholicism, the ruling establishment viewed him as a beneficent presence, compared to the seditious opponents of royal government. There was also popular enthusiasm for the first Stuart prince to establish a royal court in Edinburgh since 1603.

James cultivated an image of himself as the heir of his grandfather's Solomonic tradition, for James VI was still a revered figure in Scotland. Though he encouraged the architectural work of William

¹⁶⁷ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 226–230.

¹⁶⁸ H. Ouston, "York in Edinburgh," 133.

¹⁶⁹ "Kincardine," *Spottiswoode*, II, 216–20.

Bruce, Robert Mylne, and James Smith (a Catholic-educated designer), Masonic historians have long assumed that he was the first Stuart king in three reigns who did not become a Freemason. However, that claim was made by Anderson who, though a native Scot, was a staunch supporter of the Protestant revolution which overthrew James II in 1688. According to the eighteenth-century Clermont Rite, Sir William Bruce served as chief of the secret Templar-Masonic order from 1679 until 1686, at the time when he was closely associated with James.¹⁷⁰ Moreover, until the death of Kincardine in July 1680, James was the intimate friend of that loyal and idealistic Mason. As we shall see, James would receive important Masonic support in Scotland when he succeeded to the throne in 1685. Moreover, in 1777 his grandson, "Bonnie Prince Charlie," would reveal to an initiate of a German Templar lodge that "the secret Grand Mastership of the Masons was hereditary in the house of Stuart."¹⁷¹

James was probably introduced to military masonry during the Interregnum, when he frequently worked with Scottish and Irish engineers serving with him in the French army.¹⁷² During his residence in Edinburgh, he took a keen interest in architectural projects, which were often minutely supervised from Whitehall by Lauderdale. In fact, Cruickshanks argues that James "led an artistic renaissance with the rebuilding of much of Holyrood Palace."¹⁷³ Many private as well as public buildings now included heraldic devices and deliberate reminders of Scotland's historic independence and links with a wider European scientific and artistic world.¹⁷⁴ Determined to extend Charles's intellectual and virtuoso culture to Scotland, James made Edinburgh an extension of the Stuart court. During his cultural campaign, he received strong support from Sir George Mackenzie, Lord Advocate, who was an old friend of Lauderdale and Moray and who shared the latter's devotion to bonded friendship, stoic philosophy, and scientific heraldry.¹⁷⁵ Like Moray, Mackenzie hoped that the New Philosophy could overcome religious fanaticism,

¹⁷⁰ W. Zimmerman, *Von den alten*, 375.

¹⁷¹ Paul Monod, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688–1788* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989), 303.

¹⁷² F.M.G. Higham, *King James the Second* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1934), 44.

¹⁷³ E. Cruickshanks, *Glorious Revolution*, 47.

¹⁷⁴ M. Glendinning, *History*, 71–84.

¹⁷⁵ Kincardine MS.5050.f.95; D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 182; list of Mackenzie's publications in *DNB*.

and he published *Religio Stoici; the Virtuoso or Stoick with a Friendly Address to the Fanatics of all Sects and Sorts* (1663).

Sharing James's interest in chivalric revival, Mackenzie now prepared a treatise on *The Science of Heraldry* (1680), which paid tribute to the "auld alliance" with France and defined many themes that would later emerge in the knightly degrees of *Écossais* Freemasonry. Dedicating the work "to my country-men," Mackenzie lamented that "we only of all nations have never published anything, to let the world know what marks of honour our predecessors had gained."¹⁷⁶ He became fascinated by heraldry while studying in France, and he subsequently explored a vast literature on the subject. Drawing on Aldrovandus and Favyn, he cited a Biblical "Jacobite" origin for heraldry: "some think that the giving of arms arose from the example of Jacob blessing his children, in which he gave them marks of distinction." He then traced the contributions made by Godfrey of Bouillon and other crusaders at Jerusalem, as well as the French king who made the Scottish archers his personal bodyguard ("an honour they retain to this day"). Now encouraged by James, Mackenzie's friends revived the Royal Company of Archers, which had traditional links with the *Garde Écossais* and which stressed fraternal loyalty, militaristic royalism, and patriotic achievement.

Provoked by Ashmole's claims for the Garter, Mackenzie argued the priority of the Order of the Thistle, which was created in 787 A.D. to honor the alliance between the French king Charlemagne and the Scottish king Achaius, who defeated the English king Athelstan. Robert the Bruce subsequently revived the Thistle and contributed new arms for the citizens of Aberdeen to honor their victory over the English. After the Reformation the order was suppressed as "a Dreg of Popery," but many Scottish nobles kept its symbols alive in their heraldic arms, architectural decorations, and emblematic coins.¹⁷⁷ Despite Mackenzie's nationalist fervor, he was careful to praise the current union of Scotland and England under their Stuart king. Determined to build a secure power base in Scotland, James was impressed by Mackenzie's claims, and he would later revive the Thistle as a royalist chivalric order.

¹⁷⁶ Sir George Mackenzie, *The Science of Heraldry* (Edinburgh: printed by the heir of Andrew Anderson, 1680), preface, 2.

¹⁷⁷ See Alexander Nisbet, *A System of Heraldry, Speculative and Practical* (Edinburgh: J. Mackuen, 1722), 114; he utilized Mackenzie's manuscript collections on heraldry.

In one provocative passage, Mackenzie pointed to the linkage of heraldic and Vitruvian ideals—a linkage with Masonic resonance:

The reasons of the names, and designations of the several points [of the shield], is from the several parts of man, who is in *Heraldry*, *Architecture*, and *Painting*, the true measure of all *Simetrie*, and *Perfection* . . .¹⁷⁸

In January 1679 Mackenzie was admitted freeman of a craftsman's corporation (which Gould reports in a Masonic context), and he had many Masonic associates.¹⁷⁹ His arguments about heraldry, the Thistle, and the Garter would later influence the development of chivalric high degrees in Scots-Irish and *Écossais* Masonry.

Another strong supporter of James's virtuoso campaign was Sir Robert Sibbald, royal geographer, who had earlier been a protégé of Moray. Like Gilbert Burnet earlier, Sibbald had visited the Jews' synagogue in Amsterdam and Catholic chapels in Paris, experiences that "disposed me to affect charity for all good men of any persuasion."¹⁸⁰ Introduced to Moray by his cousin Patrick Drummond, Sibbald absorbed Moray's scientific and ethical beliefs:

He [Drummond] sometimes stayed at Court with Sir Robert Moray, the famous virtuoso, and acquainted me with the curious experiments made by him; his letters were excellent and full of good advices; his friendship confirmed me in the love and practice of a virtuous and philosophick life.¹⁸¹

Sibbald collected rare works on Cabalism, Lullism, Hermeticism, and Rosicrucianism, and his library became a valuable resource for students of "speculative" Freemasonry.¹⁸² For the Catholic James, the support of the Episcopal Sibbald for toleration was invaluable during his stay in Scotland. In fact, the two men virtually revived Moray's earlier successful policy of religious and political moderation.

James introduced his English physician Sir Charles Scarborough to Sibbald, and the three men developed a plan to construct a Royal College of Physicians in Edinburgh in 1681.¹⁸³ Scarborough had been

¹⁷⁸ G. Mackenzie, *Science*, 24.

¹⁷⁹ R. Gould, *History*, II, 60.

¹⁸⁰ Robert Sibbald, *The Remains of Sir Robert Sibbald, Knight, M.D.* (Edinburgh: T.S. Stevenson, 1833), 15–17, 30.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 19.

¹⁸² See *Catalogus Bibliothecae Sibbaldianae* (Edinburgh, 1707) and *Bibliotheca Sibbaldiana* (Edinburgh, 1722). Sibbald owned virtually every work that I have discussed as having Cabalistic, Rosicrucian, and Masonic significance.

¹⁸³ W.S. Craig, *History of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh* (Oxford: Blackwell Scientific, 1976), 61–62.

the protégé and successor of Dr. William Harvey, the old friend of Robert Fludd, and he participated in their Hermetic and Cabalistic studies. As a youth, Wren studied anatomy and dissection under Scarborough, who influenced his student's mathematical approach to physiology and design.¹⁸⁴ Like Wren, Scarborough developed a close friendship with Moray and shared his interest in architecture and operative masonry. While in Scotland, he solicited the support of James Drummond, Fourth Earl of Perth for the medical college, and the earl would later play a leading role in Jacobite Freemasonry.¹⁸⁵ Like Sibbald, Scarborough amassed a great occultist library, which included works by Rabbi Abraham, Trithemius, Postel, Dee, Bruno, Scaliger, Fludd, Kircher, Van Helmont, etc., and many architectural tracts on masonry, fortification, and dialling.¹⁸⁶ It seems certain that James was aware of his physician's interests, for the two worked closely together.

James also received the service of John Falconer, a Scottish expert in cryptography, who was entrusted with his private cipher.¹⁸⁷ Falconer argued that cryptography derived from Hebrew roots, noting that "some will have it, that Ezra invented the Hebrew character upon some such motives."¹⁸⁸ Analyzing the methods of Trithemius, Baptista Porta, Bacon, Wilkins, and Kircher, he made important breakthroughs in code-making, which would later be used in Jacobite and French military intelligence. Like Robert Hooke, who argued that John Dee's angelic conversations contained an ingenious diplomatic code, Falconer argued that Trithemius's mystical expressions were "all cryptography." Because Falconer knew many of the royalist Masons in Scotland, his instructions on "Saemaelogia" and "Dactylogy" (secret communication by signs, gestures, and fingers), as well as "Arthrologia" (discovering by "the joynts or remarkable parts of a Man's Body") may have influenced the complex and often indecipherable codes and body-language used by later Jacobite Masons.

During James's residence in Edinburgh, he was accompanied by his second wife, the Catholic Mary of Modena, and he displayed

¹⁸⁴ C. Wren, *Parentalia*, 185.

¹⁸⁵ See ahead, Chapter Twelve.

¹⁸⁶ *Bibliotheca Scarburghiana* (London: Christopher Bateman, 1694/5).

¹⁸⁷ D. Kahn, *Codebreakers*, 155.

¹⁸⁸ John Falconer, *Rules for Explaining and Deciphering All Manner of Secret Writing* (London: Dan Brown, 1692), 6, 101–12, 160–75. Falconer later deciphered the Duke of Argyll's correspondence, which led to the exposure of his plot against James's succession.

such “morally upright behavior” that he gained the respect of most Scots who—for a halcyon period—were able to accept his advocacy of toleration for Catholics, Protestant Dissenters, Quakers, and Jews. According to Thomas Bruce, Earl of Ailesbury, who admired James’s accomplishments in Scotland, the “Duke of York . . . ever preached up liberty of conscience.”¹⁸⁹ In 1679 when Alexander Dickson, professor of Hebrew at Edinburgh University, was removed for refusing to sign the oath of allegiance, James approved the appointment of Alexander Amedeus, a Florentine Jew, to the post.¹⁹⁰

The royal brother’s actions did not go unnoticed south of the border, where radical opponents linked toleration for Jews to Rosicrucian intrigue and Francophilia. In 1680 an English translation of *The Count of Gabalis* appeared in London, claiming to be published by “the Cabalistical Society of the Sages, at the Sign of the Rosycrucian.” The author worried that many of his friends “do seriously study” these “Mysteries of Cabalism,” and therefore he must refute them “by the strength of solid arguments.”¹⁹¹ The latter consisted of railing against the Frenchified nature of the eroticized spirituality of “the Cabalistic sciences.” The Cabalist, both Jewish and Christian, is “a great hater of women; yet much addicted to Venery, in a philosophical way”; thus, “only a Frenchman would give credit to Cabalistic whimsies.”

In the northern kingdom, James may have learned of Quaker interest in the Cabalistic system of Van Helmont, who was widely believed to be a “Judaized” Rosicrucian. The duke was a close friend of William Penn, the Quaker leader and a supporter of the Stuarts’ toleration policy. Van Helmont had won over Penn’s Scottish friend George Keith to his Cabalistic beliefs, and Keith in turn recruited Helmont to Quakerism. Keith was convinced of similarities between the Quaker doctrine of inner light and the Christian-Cabalistic notion of the “Christ within.”¹⁹² He and Helmont further believed that a synthesis of Cabala and Christianity could provide a “a nucleus for

¹⁸⁹ Thomas Bruce, *Memoirs of Thomas, Earl of Ailesbury*. Roxburghe Club. (Westminster: Nichols, 1890), I, 61, 169.

¹⁹⁰ A. Levy, “Origins,” 134–35. Amedeus may have converted to Christianity by this time.

¹⁹¹ *The Count of Gabalis: or, the Extravagant Mysteries of the Cabalists*, trans. P. Ayres (London, 1680), Dedication, 1–2.

¹⁹² Allison Coudert, “A Quaker-Kabbalist Controversy: George Fox’s Reaction to Francis Mercury van Helmont,” *JWCI*, 39 (1976), 170–89.

a religious movement uniting Catholics, Protestants, Pagans, and Jews." Encouraged by James's sympathy for Quakers, Penn's movement attracted many new followers in Scotland. Given this eclectic and tolerant environment, it is not surprising that lodge records in Aberdeen, written circa 1679–80, indicate the presence of Quakers, as well as "landowners, merchants and craftsmen," among the Freemasons.¹⁹³ One royalist Mason who supported the Quakers was the Earl of Perth, who was Penn's partner in the settlement of East New Jersey in 1681.¹⁹⁴

In the portraits of two members of the Aberdeen lodge there appear in the background the pillars of Jachin and Boaz, suggesting their Masonic initiation into Solomon's Temple.¹⁹⁵ James's revival of his grandfather's Solomonic policies was effective and popular in Scotland, and his support of religious toleration was widely believed to be sincere. When he returned to London in March 1682, he left behind in Edinburgh a reservoir of good will and patriotic support, especially among the royalist Masons who would later defend his threatened throne.

In 1680 Christopher Wren was persuaded to accept the presidency of the Royal Society in what was an urgently needed salvage operation. At the same time, he continued his role as Surveyor of the King's Works, while he and Hooke carried on the massive task of rebuilding more than fifty churches in London. However, the Whigs' campaign to exclude James from the succession polarized England, while increasingly radical attacks were made on the royalist institutions which supported Stuart claims. Wren was dismayed when parliament withdrew its support and cut off the funds for many of his projects.¹⁹⁶

Fighting back against the Exclusionists, the poet laureate Dryden published *Absalom and Achitophel* (1681) to counter critics who threatened to destroy hereditary monarchy. Portraying Buckingham as "Zimri," Dryden mocked the inconstancy and opportunism of the duke and his Whig opposition party. Zimri's enthusiasms shifted from

¹⁹³ D. Stevenson, *First Freemasons*, 136–39, 142.

¹⁹⁴ "James Drummond, Fourth Earl and First Duke of Perth," *DNB*. For his Masonic affiliation, see John Yarker, "Drummond—Earls of Perth," *AQC*, 14 (1901), 138.

¹⁹⁵ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 147.

¹⁹⁶ B. Little, *Wren*, 109.

chemistry to whoredom, and after "He laughed himself from court," he "then sought relief/ By forming parties, but could ne'er be chief." After charging Buckingham with womanizing, Dryden defended Charles II against the same charge by making a bizarre appeal to Jewish precedent:

In pious times, ere priestcraft did begin,
 Before polygamy was made a sin;
 When man on many multiplied his kind,
 Ere one to one was cursedly confined;
 When nature prompted, but no law denied
 Promiscuous use of concubine and bride;
 Then Israel's monarch after heaven's own heart,
 His vigorous warmth did variously impart
 To wives and slaves; and, wide as his command,
 Scattered his maker's image through the land.
 Michal, of royal blood, the crown did wear;
 A soil ungrateful to the tiller's care:
 Not so the rest; for several mothers bore
 To godlike David several sons before.¹⁹⁷

Dryden may have been aware that Moray and Lauderdale had both counseled the king that the Jewish tradition of polygamy would justify his taking another wife, since Queen Catherine was barren.¹⁹⁸

Addressing "foolish Israel! never warned by ill," Dryden utilized a potent architectural image to predict the destruction of the edifice of state by opponents of hereditary succession:

All other errors but disturb a state,
 But innovation is the blow of fate.
 If ancient fabrics nod, and threat to fall,
 To patch the flaws, and buttress up the wall,
 Thus far 'tis duty. But here fix the mark
 For all beyond it is to touch our ark.
 To change foundations, cast the frame anew,
 Is work for rebels, who base ends pursue,
 At once divine and human laws control,
 And mend the parts by ruin of the whole.

.....

Now what relief can righteous David bring?
 How fatal 'tis to be too good a king!¹⁹⁹

¹⁹⁷ Keith Walker, ed., *John Dryden* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987), 179.

¹⁹⁸ G. Burnet, *History*, I, 470-71.

¹⁹⁹ K. Walker, *Dryden*, 198.

Roper observes that the allusion here is not just to any ancient building; it contains the “Ark” and is therefore Solomon’s Temple with the Ark of the Covenant in its inmost sanctuary.²⁰⁰ Dryden’s royalist readers would think of the great English temple of St. Paul’s, where Inigo Jones’s “radical design still did not ‘touch the Ark,’” but instead incorporated the fourteenth-century choir into the “powerful new design.”²⁰¹ For Charles II, James, Wren, Hooke, and the royalist architects of church and state, Dryden’s poem provided important support for continuation of the Stuart heritage. This renewed emphasis on Hebraic-Stuart traditions perhaps prompted the visit of James’s daughter Princess Anne to the Bevis Marks synagogue during Passover in 1681, after which she was entertained at “the Jews house.”²⁰² At this time, the leader of the synagogue was Rabbi Jacob Abendana, who had earlier praised the Scottish exiles who supported the Stuart restoration.²⁰³

Dryden’s royalist architectural propaganda was countered by Edward Harley, whose Moray-influenced moderation was giving way to Tonge-influenced fear of Catholic inroads. In *An Humble Essay Toward the Settlement of Peace and Truth in the Church, as a Certain Foundation of Lasting Union* (1681), Harley revived the Puritan argument about the priority of verbal preaching over ceremony, ornamentation, and architecture. Beginning with an epigraph from Hosea 8:6 (“The Workman made it therefore it is not God”), Harley admitted the divine origins of the Solomonic Temple but then traced the decay of subsequent Jewish temples. Under Solomon the wisest of men, the place for the Temple was designed by God, and consecrated by fire from heaven, and all the buildings and apartments of the Temple were according to the Pattern David had by the Spirit.²⁰⁴ But God subsequently allowed the deterioration of ritual tradition, which was the reason “the structure of Zorobabel’s Temple was so sadly unlike the Magnificence of Solomon’s.” Then, “at last the Temple was utterly destroyed,” an act of God’s mercy “to the believing Jews and Gentiles.”

²⁰⁰ Alan Roper, *Dryden’s Poetic Kingdoms* (London, 1965), 17–18.

²⁰¹ Howard Erskine-Hill, “Heirs of Vitruvius: Pope and the Idea of Architecture,” in Howard Erskine-Hill and Anne Smith, eds., *The Art of Alexander Pope* (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1979), 146.

²⁰² R. Barnett, “Pepys’ Contacts,” 31.

²⁰³ D. Katz, *Jews in History*, 288.

²⁰⁴ [Edward Harley], *An Humble Essay Toward the Settlement of Peace and Truth in the Church* (London: N. Simmons, 1681), 16.

Fortunately, the misguided attempt by the Jews to rebuild the Temple under Julian the Apostate was foiled by fire and tempest. In a plea for toleration of Dissenters but suppression of Catholics, Harley argued that now only a spiritual temple is needed. Later, remembering the linkage between Jewish and Catholic rights under the Stuarts, he would assert, "For this is the true *Cabala*—that Christ Jesus came into the World to save even Chief Sinners," while the Protestant Jesus is the only "Corner-Stone" for re-building the Temple of Jerusalem.²⁰⁵

The intensifying polarization between parliamentary iconoclasts and royalist image-makers intensified after James returned to London. On 21 April 1682, he attended a performance of Thomas Otway's *Venice Preserv'd, or a Plot Discover'd*, which addressed the spread of factionalism in the wake of the Popish Plot. In Venice a group of conspirators (modelled on Shaftesbury and his Whig allies) cynically reject the value of "honesty" or loyalty, as they plot to overthrow the legitimate ruler. Linking the English radicals to seditiously Judaized Covenanters, Otway named one Spinoza and another Jaffair, who is "the sworn and covenanted foe of Venice."²⁰⁶ Targeting those members of Parliament who refused to fund or implement the king's policies, Otway presented a nation on the verge of disaster:

The publick Stock's a Beggar; one Venetian
Trusts not another: Look into their Stores
Of general safety; Empty Magazines,
A tatter'd Fleet, a murmuring unpaid Army,
Bankrupt Nobility, a harrast Commonalty,
A Factious, giddy, and divided Senate,
Is all the strength of Venice: Let's destroy it . . .²⁰⁷

When the play was first performed in February, Otway presented an emotional appeal for the people to call James home from Scotland. Scorning the cowardice of a radical iconoclast who slashed the canvas of James's portrait, Otway reminded the audience of just how murderous faction could become. The play was a huge success and later became a Jacobite propaganda vehicle. On 3 May, when James

²⁰⁵ Edward Harley, *A Scriptural and Rational Account of the Christian Religion* (London: J. Luntley, 1695), v, 23.

²⁰⁶ Thomas Otway, *The Works of Thomas Otway*, ed. J.C. Ghosh (Oxford: Clarendon, 1932), II, 208, 222, 255.

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 225; also, II, 288–89, 217–18.

left London for Edinburgh to fetch home his wife, Otway and Dryden prepared poems to welcome her to London. On 31 May Otway staged a special performance of *Venice Preserv'd*, in which Dryden's prologue called up memories of Charles I's masques of Platonic love and Hermetic healing. When James and Mary returned in June, they were escorted by a large party of Scots and were welcomed by enthusiastic crowds in London.²⁰⁸

Ashmole must have been pleased at the public pageantry in support of James, who admired him personally and subsidized his chivalric and heraldic researches. Since 1679 Ashmole had worked closely with a master mason on his project of building a preservationist museum at Oxford to house his antiquarian and magical collections. As it neared completion, he recorded on 10 March 1682, "I received a Summons to appear next day at a Lodge in Masons-Hall London, where we admitted into the Fellowship of Free Masons" six initiates.²⁰⁹ He further noted, "I was the senior Fellow, it being 35 years since I was admitted." On 1 May 1683 James and his wife travelled to Oxford to formally open the Ashmolean Museum.²¹⁰ The Catholic curator, Dr. Robert Plot, had set up a chemical-alchemical lab in the basement, and the royal party "saw some experiments to their great satisfaction."²¹¹

Despite James's political and architectural success in Scotland, Charles II found his policies under increasing attack by his religious opponents in England. The radicals' iconoclastic fury soon ramified to Tangier, where the fate of the greatest engineering project of the century was now in the hands of the parliamentary Whigs. What alarmed them most were reports of the successful progress of the fortification and military enterprises. In 1669 the king had sent the First Earl of Middleton, Moray's former colleague, to govern Tangier, where he drew on his experience as liaison with the Dutch Jews to continue the policy of toleration.²¹² Because the stone for constructing the Mole and fortifications had to be quarried from outside the existing lines, it was crucial that he maintain good relations with the

²⁰⁸ F. Higham, *James II*, 208.

²⁰⁹ C. Josten, *Ashmole*, I, 245–46.

²¹⁰ M. Hunter, *Science*, 128–29.

²¹¹ C. Josten, *Ashmole*, IV, 1720–21.

²¹² George Hilton Jones, *Charles Middleton: The Life and Times of a Restoration Politician* (Chicago: Chicago UP, 1967), 10–17.

Jewish and Moslem inhabitants. Given his Scottish background and duties in Tangier, it seems likely that Middleton was a Mason; his grandson, the Third Earl, would later participate in the Jacobite lodge in Paris.²¹³ Despite the heavy drinking that earlier led to his dismissal from Scottish office, Middleton was an effective governor until his death in 1674.²¹⁴

His successor, the Irish governor Inchiquin, continued to rely on Simon Pariente, their trusted Jewish interpreter, and positive reports on Hebrew beliefs and customs were sent to London. Lancelot Addison, who spent several years in Tangier, drew on his conversations with local Jews to write *The Present State of the Jews, Particularly Relating to Those in Barbary* (1675), a respectful and straightforward account. Addison dedicated the work to Joseph Williamson, secretary of state, who recommended it to his friend Hooke, who subsequently read and discussed it. In 1675, during a food shortage, Inchiquin utilized crypto-Sabbatians willing to break Jewish ritual law to import salted pork for the British garrison.²¹⁵ Their heretical actions provoked the *Beth Din* of Tetuan to excommunicate the European Jews of Tangier, but Inchiquin insisted that the *herem* be lifted. When Moroccan authorities expelled all Jews as “suspected nationals” in 1677, he helped win their readmission as valuable traders in 1680.

During the 1670's, increasing numbers of masons and soldiers were shipped out from Scotland and Ireland, and they soon won popular fame for their courageous stands against Moorish attacks. However, in 1679 when the Whigs tried to force Charles II to accept the “Exclusion Bill,” they linked his willingness to deny the succession to his Catholic brother with their willingness to provide funds for Tangier. Lurid charges of Papist conspiracy among the colony's governors, troops, and masons were flung during parliamentary debates.²¹⁶ But Charles would not sacrifice his brother to save Tangier; instead, he prorogued Parliament in March 1681 and governed without it until the end of his reign.

²¹³ Edward Corp, *Lord Burlington—The Man and His Politics* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1998), 20.

²¹⁴ Samuel Pepys, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, ed. Robert Latham and William Matthews (Berkeley: California UP, 1970–83), IX, 492.

²¹⁵ T. Benady, “Role of Jews,” 47.

²¹⁶ J.C. Riley, “Catholicism and the Late Stuart Army: the Tangier Episode,” *Royal Stuart Papers XLIII* (Huntingdon: Royal Stuart Society, 1993), 1–28.

Despite Parliament's hostility, there was support for the colony in the Royal Society, which had long followed the masonic work. Henry Sheeres, FRS, was chief engineer of construction, and he sent optimistic reports to the Fellows. In 1682 the Moroccan ambassador Hamet travelled to London to urge the king to preserve the colony, and he was welcomed by Evelyn, Ashmole, and interested virtuosos to the society, where he was elected a Fellow.²¹⁷ Pressure also came from the Knights of Malta, who counted on the colonists' assistance in their struggle to liberate Christian slaves from their Moorish captors. In June 1683 the Grand Master of Malta arrived in London, where he pleaded the colony's cause and was entertained with Evelyn and Dryden.

Though Charles had proclaimed that Tangier was "the brightest jewel of his Crown," he succumbed to Parliament in 1683 and announced his decision to level the fortifications, destroy the Mole, ruin the harbour, and recall the garrison and colonists to England. It was a sad day in masonic history when the commission met in Tangier to plan the destruction of the great Mole which, as Riley notes, was an engineering feat "comparable with the construction of the Channel tunnel today."²¹⁸ The Swedish architects Tessin and Beckman, as well as Sheeres, reluctantly agreed to undo their labor of two decades.²¹⁹ It would take two thousand men working round-the-clock for three months to finally destroy the massive stoneworks. When the evacuated "Tangerines" arrived in England in April 1684, they were welcomed by the royalists as returning heroes.

The question of placing the returning troops greatly agitated Parliament, who feared that they formed a ready army to defend the Stuart cause. A Royal Warrant suggested the stationing of Lord Dumbarton's Scots regiment—which included veterans of the *Garde Écossais*—at the strategic port of Portsmouth. Perhaps with an eye to that Franco-Scottish tradition, the king proposed to make the Scotch-Irish Grenadiers his personal bodyguard. The Whigs protested these measures, and the troops were eventually dispersed throughout the country, where they were considered "eyesores." Colonel John

²¹⁷ J. Evelyn, *Diary*, III, 75, 77, 84.

²¹⁸ J. Riley, "Catholicism," 6–7.

²¹⁹ Ensign Bernard Tessin, member of the Tangier Regiment in 1683, was probably Hans Ewald's son; see *ibid.*, 22. Martin Beckman evidently became a Freemason in Scotland; see Howard Tomlinson, "The Ordnance Office and the King's Forts, 1660–1714," *AH*, 16 (1973), 17.

Fitzgerald, who earlier served as Lieutenant Governor of Tangier, had labored to abolish “that national distinction between English, Irish, and Scotch” and to maintain the “remarkable” policy of toleration.²²⁰ Blocked from promotion by anti-Irish M.P.s, Fitzgerald was falsely accused of complicity in the Popish Plot. He and his Tangerine regiment would loyally serve the Stuarts through revolution and exile.

For many royalists, the destruction of Tangier was a betrayal of the great architectural and masonic traditions of the Stuart dynasty. An anti-Whig ballad, “Tangiers Lamentation on the Demolishing and Blowing up of the Town, Castle, and Citadel,” lambasted the politicians whose political factionalism, xenophobic provincialism, and technological ignorance led to the destruction of architectural work worthy of Solomon, Hiram, and the ancient Jewish masons.

The seeds of future Masonic rivalries were planted on 6 February 1685 when Charles II, a “Mason King,” died after a four-day illness. On his deathbed, he secretly converted to Catholicism and received the last rites of the Roman church.²²¹ As far as the public knew, Charles had died as a tolerant Anglican, who hoped that Englishmen would now accept his brother, a tolerant Catholic, as King James II. However, the radical exclusionists now stepped up their campaign against the legitimacy of his brother’s succession. In order to remind Britons of the earlier storms of civil war which disrupted the natural order and to bolster the claims of James, Thomas Otway composed “Windsor Castle” in March 1685.

In his poetic “monument” to the late king, Otway strolled through Windsor Castle, seeing in its massive stone architecture a revelation of the mind and heritage of Charles II.²²² He further praised the “wonders of Fraternal love,” as exemplified by James’s behavior at Charles’s deathbed. That scene reminded him of the chivalric ideals of the Knights of the Garter, so brilliantly expressed in the intricate stone carvings of the Gothic chapel at Windsor. As James II’s cause came under fire from “The meeting of a num’rous Senate,” who provoked “bold Tumults and Disorders” throughout England, Otway’s poem provided potent royalist propaganda.

²²⁰ J. Riley, “Catholicism,” 11–12.

²²¹ For a critical examination of the false accounts given of Charles’s conversion, see R. Hutton, *Charles II*, 443–45.

²²² T. Otway, *Works*, II, 457–65.

With Britain headed into another revolution and possible civil war, the question of what “toleration” really meant took on urgent significance. Did it consist of liberty of conscience and universal brotherhood or protection of Protestantism and suppression of Catholicism? The contradictory answers would shatter the Stuarts’ attempt to build a Temple of Concord. While one man’s tolerance was defined as another’s tyranny, the struggle would ramify into the emerging “modernist” development of Freemasonry.

CHAPTER TWELVE

JAMES VII AND II AND THE MASONIC DIASPORA:
THE RUINED TEMPLE AND THE FLIGHT OF
KNIGHTS (1685–1695)

Go on, My Lords, and prosper; go repair
To Court; and kiss the hands of the TRUE HEIR

.....
An Heir refus'd (but by no Builders) strange,
Is now Chief Corner-stone! O happy change,

.....
Consult but Euclid, take the Architect
Alongst . . .

—*Caledonia's Farewell* (1685)

Some likewise say our Masons now
Do Circumcision undergo,
For Masonry's a Jewish Custom,

.....
From hence they've been for Traitors taken,
But still have Masons sav'd their Bacon;

.....
They never once have been detected:
As *Plotters* and Confederates,
Whose Heads are plac'd on Poles and Gates . . .

—*The Free Masons; an Hudibrastick Poem* (1723)

Otway's fears of "bold Tumults and Disorders" soon proved true in James II's southern kingdom, but further north the accession of James VII to the Scottish throne was welcomed by a majority of Scots, who had been charmed by the presence of their "native" prince in Edinburgh in 1679–82. James reinforced his Caledonian identification in 1684 by commissioning the portraits of one hundred eleven Scottish kings for Holyrood Palace, in remembrance of what the Privy Council called "the protection of your Royal Family above two thousand years."¹ James's friend George Mackenzie added to the Scots' sense of national antiquity and continuity with his *Jus Regium: or the Just*

¹ H. Ouston, "York in Edinburgh," 135–36.

and *Solid Foundation of Monarchy* (1684). Mackenzie's royalist philosophy, which would become the core of Jacobite Masonic belief, was based on the principle of unity and order throughout the universe, in which "Government is the King's and Property the Subject's birthright." He argued further that Scotland's continuing devotion to Latin literature and scholarship "repaired the confusion of the architects of Babel."² For the time being, Scotland seemed to uphold the Masonic ideals of antiquity, heredity, and universality—as expressed by the architects of the Temple.

In Mackenzie's reply to English aspersions on the antiquity of the Scots royal line, he recalled that James VI in *Basilikon Doron* founded the royal prerogative on Fergus I's having "made himself King and Lord, as well as the whole Lands, as of the inhabitants of Scotland." The history of the first Scottish kings suggested that they derived their authority from that of a father in his family. This internally coherent conception of government and society was personified in Scotland between 1679 and 1688 by James himself. When Mackenzie visited London, he shared these beliefs with his friends Dryden, Evelyn, and Plot, who were pleased to hear such loyalist statements from formerly rebellious Scotland.³

Just before Charles II's death in February 1685, James was on the point of returning to Edinburgh to head another Parliament, and he soon realised that he needed support from Scotland for his disputed claim to the English throne. In March, after he appealed to his northern friends to travel to London, a versified broadside was issued in Edinburgh, entitled *Caledonia's Farewell to the most Honourable James, Duke of Perth, etc. Lord High Chancellor, and William, Duke of Queensberry, etc. Lord High Treasurer of Scotland, When Called up by the King*. Ouston argues that this bizarre manifesto was published by the Freemasons.⁴ If so, it raises new questions about Anderson's claim that James II was not "a Brother Mason" and that "the Art was much neglected, and People of all Sorts were otherwise engag'd in this Reign."⁵ As we shall see, James may have been initiated in Scotland but not England, and thus was removed from Anderson's Anglicized, anti-Jacobite version of Masonic history.

² Andrew Lang, *Sir George Mackenzie* (London: Longman's, Green, 1909), 300.

³ Ibid., 181, 280, 297, 307.

⁴ H. Ouston, "York in Edinburgh," 135, 154. Rare copy of broadside in National Library of Scotland.

⁵ J. Anderson, *Constitutions* (1738), 105–06.

Ouston's case is reinforced by Drummond family tradition, which affirms that James Drummond, First Duke of Perth, and his brother John, Fourth Earl of Melfort, were Freemasons.⁶ An architectural enthusiast, Perth solicited employment and "got a gifte" for the Rome-educated architect James Smith, who was son of a Catholic master mason, son-in-law of the royal master mason Robert Mylne, and member of the Edinburgh lodge.⁷ William Douglas, First Duke of Queensbury, then recommended Smith to Charles II, who appointed him Scottish Surveyor of Works in 1683. At the time when *Caledonia's Farewell* was published, Smith was advised by Mylne and William Bruce, current Grand Master (according to Anderson), while he was employed by Queensberry in the rebuilding of Drumlanrig Castle, destined to become "one of Scotland's great setpieces of castellar/Baroque palace design."⁸ Thus, there was a tightly-knit Masonic context for the unusual manifesto.

The tract targeted James's opponents in England, and its author utilised mystical Masonic mathematics to prove the antiquity and legitimacy of his claim to the throne:

Go on, My Lords, and prosper; Go, repair
 To Court; and Kiss the Hands of the TRUE HEIR
 Of Fivescore Kings and Ten, Four Diadems,
 And Kingdoms Three: an Heir, whose Royal Stems
 From British, Saxon, Danish, Norman Blood;
 With Scots and Irish, makes His Title good
 'Gainst all Seclusion. And whose Entry's blest
 With an auspicious Peace, and he possest
 O' th' Thrones of His Ancestors, without stirr
 From any discontented snarling Curr,
 An Heir refus'd (but by no Builders) strange,
 Is now Chief Corner-stone! O happy change,
 And ne'r a Sword Unsheathe'd! Lo, Slighted He,
 Seems strangely by the Fates, ordain'd to be
 The Basis of Our Rest: Let those go pry,
 Who hidden Virtues say, in Numbers ly,

⁶ J. Yarker, "Drummond," 138; Edward Corp, "Melfort: a Jacobite Connoisseur," *History Today* (October 1995), 46, and *Lord Burlington—The Man and His Politics* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1998), 11, 20–21.

⁷ D. Stevenson, *First Freemasons*, 17; James Macauley, "The Seventeenth-century Genesis of Hamilton Palace," in John Frew and David Jones, eds., *Aspects of Scottish Classicism* (St. Andrews: St. Andrews UP, 1988), 17–24.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 16; M. Glendinning, *History*, 85; H.M. Colvin, "A Scottish Origin for English Palladianism," *AH*, 17 (1974), 8.

Who speaks the * HUNDREDTH and ELEVENTH, since He
 Stands such from FERGUS, in the Royal Tree.
 Consult but Euclid, take the Architect
 Alongst; try, what One Figure doth direct
 those Arts of Kin; see, what Support the All
 of the Cementing Trade . . .⁹

The asterisk pointed to a lengthy footnote which demonstrated James's legitimacy by mathematical and architectural proofs:

* The number of an hundredth and eleven, when Ciphred, is but the first Figure in Arithmetick, by position thus thrice repeated (111) and which, by advancing the middlemost, after this manner disposed.' makes, when handsomly in right angles conjoyned, a straight aequilateral Triangle \triangle and such is reckoned to be the first Figure in Geometrie (parallel Lines without some closing Ligament, never being lookt upon as any denominated Figure) and this Triangle is said to be in Architecture, of all aedificial Superstructures, the first truest and firmest Basis whence the Grecians denominated a King . . .

Later Jacobite Masons utilised the emblem of three dots forming a triangle as a sign of their membership in the fraternity.

The poet produced further convoluted calculations, coupled with historical and dynastic claims, which would throw all exclusionist arguments "out of doors":

. . . if you can but in this cryptick way of compting, allow the three ticks to pass for Crowns, see then but, reflect and consider, by what strange and mysterious Algebra, this our Hundredth and eleventh KING, may be said, and is found to be *Basis Tou Laou* [in Greek letters: "Base of the People"].¹⁰

At the conclusion of the footnote, an emblem of an equilateral triangle with number 111 inside rested on the base of SCOTLAND, while ENGLAND and IRELAND lay on the upper angles. Perth and Queensberry were urged to inform the English that this "Riddle, open'd with a thinking Skill,/ Might well have made the COMMONS cast their Bill." Did the Scottish Freemasons hope to influence their brethren in the south? The main text continued with a peroration that "CALEDONIA loves the STUARTS well" and prophesied the

⁹ *Caledonia's Farewell* (Edinburgh: printed by the Heir of Andrew Anderson, 1685).

¹⁰ I am grateful to Professors Cynthia and Richard Patterson for deciphering the poorly printed Greek letters.

intensification of ties of loyalty between the Scottish mother and royal father of Great Britain.

On 23 April Perth warned the Scottish Council about increasingly violent actions by militant Covenanters, who sought to destroy the temple of established religion and royal government: "We have a new sect sprung up among us from the dunghill, the very dregs of the people, who kill by pretended inspiration, and instead of the temple of the Lord, had nothing in their mouths but the word."¹¹ Perth was supported in his campaign to preserve the temple by John Graham of Claverhouse (later Viscount Dundee), who had recently married the daughter of Lord Cochrane, a dissident Mason, and by Colin Lindsay, Third Earl of Balcarres, protégé of the deceased Masonic leader Moray.¹² Later Jacobite Masons would claim John Graham as Grand Master of the revived Templar Order in Scotland.¹³

After Perth, Queensberry, and their party travelled to London to build support for James's cause, their Masonic appeal was reinforced by Dryden, friend and admirer of George Mackenzie. On 3 June 1685 Dryden produced an expanded version of *Albion and Albanus: an Opera*, which expressed themes of magic, chivalry, heraldry, and architecture—subjects of great interest to the royalist Scottish Masons. Archon, the hero, was modelled on General Monk, who "From the Caledonian Shore" came to restore Albion-Charles from his exile.¹⁴ In order to overcome Democracy and Zeal, Archon uses Hermetic magic to hypnotise them into a non-resisting trance. Alluding to the Smaragdine Tablet, Juno assures Hermes that now "'Tis Peace above/As 'tis below." While *Caledonia's Farewell* urged the ancient mother Caledonia to nurse her Stuart son, *Albion and Albanus* urges Augusta (London) to return to Albion's "Genial Bed" in order to complete the cosmic marriage.

Albion is restored a second time when "Acacia" (Innocence) saves him from Titus Oates's fraudulent Popish Plot. This usage of the acacia for Stuart propaganda may explain its adoption as the symbolical

¹¹ Magnus Linklater and Christian Hesketh, *For King and Conscience: John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee, 1648–1689* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989), 126.

¹² A. Lindsay, *Lives of the Lindsays*, 120, 179. On Lord Cochrane, see D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 200–01.

¹³ For the controversial claims, see A. Waite, *New Encyclopaedia*, I, 406; II, 223–27; M. Baigent and R. Leigh, *Temple and Lodge*, 224–34.

¹⁴ J. Dryden, *Works*, XV, 22, 26–27.

plant of Freemasonry. According to Hebrew tradition, acacia was the sole wood used in construction of the Tabernacle and, "acacia trees would line the path of the returning exiles and would make the wasteland bloom at the time of redemption" (*Isaiah* 4:19).¹⁵ The Scottish Mason Kenneth Mackenzie explains that,

[Acacia] was the sacred wood of the Jews, called Shittah, in the plural Shittim. The emblem of initiation, immortality, and innocence. The acacia was used to indicate the place where dead bodies had been interred among the Jews . . .¹⁶

In *Écossais* rites, the body of the betrayed architect Hiram is discovered under a branch of acacia, which comes easily away from the recently disturbed earth.¹⁷ Thus, Dryden's usage was consistent with the Jewish-Masonic tradition, for the betrayed and assassinated nation is revived and proved innocent by Acacia. The term "Acacian" also came to denote "a Mason, who, by a strict obedience to the obligations and precepts of the Fraternity, is free from sin."

When Dryden revised the opera after Charles II's death, he added an apotheosis that sent the late king to heaven and welcomed his brother's accession. Acacia asks heaven to "Make room for our new Deity," because "Albion the Great/Must change his Seat,/For Hee's adopted there."¹⁸ Now Albanus-James will fulfill the ideals of chivalric fraternity: "*Albanus* Lord of Land and Main,/Shall with fraternal virtues Reign." As the chorus repeats "all that Acacia sung," the scene changes to an architectural display of Windsor Castle: "In the Air is a vision of the Honors of the Garter, the Knights in Procession, and the King under a Canopy: Beyond this, the upper end of St. George's Hall."

In the Epilogue, James's widely-recognized reputation for keeping his word was made the basis of a new contract with Britain:

He plights his Faith; and we believe him just;
His Honour is to Promise, ours to Trust.
Thus Britain's Basis on a Word is laid,
As by a Word the World it self was made.

¹⁵ See "Acacia," *Encyclopaedia Judaica*.

¹⁶ K. Mackenzie, *Royal Masonic*, 13.

¹⁷ D. Beresniak, *Symbols*, 75.

¹⁸ J. Dryden, *Works*, XV, 50-55.

Would Scottish Masons have thought of the Mason Word as they watched or read Dryden's opera? All of this drama took place within an elaborate architectural setting of symbolic palaces and columns, embossed with heraldic emblems, which were initially destroyed by rebels. Dryden made London lament, "My Turrets on the ground/That once my Temples crown'd!" But he stressed that the Temples were earlier restored by Monk and Ogilby, and he instructed that "the 4 Triumphal Arches erected at his Majesties Coronation" would be shown on the stage. As noted earlier, these arches featured elaborate mathematical, architectural, and masonic symbolism.

The royalists' stress on chivalric and Temple themes raised hopes at Malta that the new Catholic king would restore the Knights Hospitallers of Jerusalem in Britain. In 1685 the Grand Master Gregory Carafa sent a special mission to London to congratulate James II on his accession and to ascertain his views on the order's reinstatement.¹⁹ The king was seriously interested, despite the expected opposition from Parliament and formidable financial obstacles, and a special commission was appointed to consider "the conditions under which a complete restoration of the Tongue to its ancient position should be feasible." In 1687 James sent his natural son Henry Fitz-James to Malta, where the Grand Master conferred upon him a diamond Cross of the Order. Thus, the merging of Stuart-chivalric-Temple affiliations, which later surfaced in Jacobite Masonic traditions, may have begun in these London-Malta negotiations.

The tributes of Otway and Dryden to the Solomonic-Hermetic traditions of the Stuart dynasty were especially timely for the Jewish community, whose status was dependent on the new king's good will. During the first two months of James's reign, Jewish representatives presented to him a loyal address on parchment and visited his palace five times.²⁰ Their actions would long be remembered and resented by anti-Jacobites, who preserved an odd tradition about the Jews' claim of heavenly support for James's succession. Writing in 1748, in the wake of the recently crushed Stuart rebellion, the Whig propagandist Henry Fielding attacked the insidious combination of Jacobites, Jews, and Freemasons. In passing, he referred to the Jewish support of James II:

¹⁹ W. Bedford and R. Holbeche, *Order of Hospital*, 104.

²⁰ D. Katz, *Jews in History*, 146–52.

... the *Jacobite* rabbins tell us, that on *Friday, Feb. 6, 1684/5*, one of the Angels, I forget which, came to *Whitehall* at Noon-day, without being perceived by anyone, and brought with him a Commission from Heaven, which he delivered to the then Duke of *York*, by which the said duke was indefeasibly created King of *England, Scotland, and Ireland*...

And as there is so great an Analogy between the *Jews* and the *Jacobites*, so hath there been the same likeness between their Kings.²¹

In May 1685 the Jews were forced to petition James for protection, when a group of City merchants argued that Charles II's endenizations of Jews were no longer valid and that they should now pay customs duty. The Jews were supported by Sir Peter Killigrew, who ordered the arrest of the complaining customs official. As noted earlier, Thomas Killigrew had earlier signed Charles's statements of toleration for the Jews and Rabbi Leon's patent to exhibit the Temple model. In October a second attack was mounted, when several merchants instigated the arrests of half the community and, under an antiquated statute of Queen Elizabeth, inflicted penalties for the Jews' non-attendance at church. The *Mahamad* warned the merchants and court officials that the affair would cause "great Scandall and prejudice of their Credit and Reputation both here and abroad."²² The rabbis stressed that the new king was presently unaware of the persecuting campaign which would greatly reduce royal revenues from the customs.

In November the *Mahamad* was relieved when James II followed his brother's example and issued an order to stop all proceedings against the Hebrew community: "His Majesty's Intention being that they should not be troubled upon this account, but quietly enjoy the free exercise of their Religion, whilst they behave themselves dutifully and obediently to his Government." Barnett stresses the historical importance of James's order: "Here was a clear statement of toleration, well in line with, or even ahead of, the most advanced nations in Europe—by which the Anglo-Jewish community was at last made safe and has lived in security ever since."²³ Katz agrees that James "gave the Jews of England what amounted to a Declaration of Indulgence," but he also notes that it was inextricably linked with

²¹ Henry Fielding, *The Jacobite's Journal and Related Writings*, ed. W.B. Coley (Wesleyan UP, 1975), 282, 285. For his linking of Jacobites, Freemasons, and Cabalists, see 95–98, 103, 109.

²² D. Katz, *Jews in History*, 149–50.

²³ R. Barnett, "Pepys' Contacts," 31.

the disputed issue of the king's prerogative.²⁴ Thus, when Parliament argued against James's dispensing power to exempt Catholic military officers from the operation of the Test Act, the Jews followed the case closely and supported his dispensations to Catholics.

The propaganda of Otway and Dryden perhaps influenced or reflected a new phase of royalist Masonic activity. On 28 July 1685 the Grand Master Arlington died. Like Charles II, he converted to Catholicism on his death bed. According to Anderson, the London lodges then met and elected Christopher Wren as Grand Master, who appointed Gabriel Cibber and Edward Strong as Grand Wardens: "and while carrying on St. Paul's, he annually met those Brethren that could attend him, to keep up good old usages."²⁵ Perhaps the published Masonic support of James in Scotland inspired Wren to take on a greater leadership role. Believing that "Architecture has its political Use," he resented Parliament's withdrawal of once-promised funds, especially for his plan to erect a great mausoleum for Charles I at Windsor.²⁶ As political turmoil further threatened royalist building projects, Wren selected certain craftsmen to form a loyal corps around him. At the Office of Works, he built up a special team, composed of the architects and masons who collaborated closely with him.²⁷ It was probably from these private, even secretive actions, that the oral traditions of Wren's leadership of Jacobite Masonry developed.

James II always supported Wren, and he promised financial aid to the Royal Society to build "its long-desired college."²⁸ He also maintained friendships with royalist virtuosos such as Hooke and Evelyn, whose expertise in architecture he admired. In September 1685 Evelyn accompanied James to Portsmouth, where they examined the construction of a new quay, fortifications, and ship-yard—carried out by English masons. He then recorded his impression of the new king:

²⁴ David Katz, "The Jews of England and 1688," in O. Grell, *From Persecution*, 223–24.

²⁵ J. Anderson, *Constitutions* (1738), 106.

²⁶ R.A. Beddard, "Wren's Mausoleum for Charles I and the Cult of the Royal Martyr," *AH*, 27 (1984), 36–47.

²⁷ B. Little, *Wren*, 137; Joseph Rykvert, *The First Moderns: The Architects of the Eighteenth Century* (Boston: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1980), 147.

²⁸ M. Hunter, *Science*, 128.

By what I observed in this journey, is that infinite industry, sedulity, gravity, and great understanding and experience of affairs, in his Majesty, that I cannot but predict much happiness to the nation, as to its political government; and, if so persist, there could be nothing more desired to accomplish our prosperity, but that he was of the national religion.²⁹

It was during this journey that Evelyn discussed with James the Scottish gift of second sight, but it is unknown whether they considered this an expertise of Scottish Masons.

Perhaps sensing a growing significance for Freemasonry in the royalist cause, John Aubrey recorded in his manuscript "Natural History of Wiltshire" (1686) information about masons that he earlier received from William Dugdale. The brackets enclose Aubrey's corrections:

... about Henry the third's time, the Pope gave a Bull or diploma [patent] to a company of Italian architects [Freemasons] to travell up and downe over all Europe to build Churches. From those are derived the *Fraternity of Free-Masons* [Accepted-Masons]. They are known to one another by certayn Signes and Marks [scratched out] and Watchwords; it continues to this day. They have Severall Lodges in severall Counties for their reception: and when any of them fall into decay, the brotherhood is to relieve him, etc. The manner of their Adoption is very formall, and with an Oath of Secrecy.³⁰

As noted previously, in the 1670's Aubrey recorded in "Chronologica Architectonica" his "conversation about freemasons" with Dugdale and Wren. He now loaned that manuscript to Evelyn, who added comments on various masonic projects.

Since childhood, Aubrey's "greatest delight" had been to "be continually with the artificers" (such as masons, carpenters, and joiners) and thus "to understood their trade."³¹ He was "a kind of engineer," who progressed from drawing "plain outlines" to making detailed studies of masonic and architectural design and technology. In 1656, when he lamented that Francis Bacon's house was "defaced, so that one would have thought the Barbarians had made a conquest here," he dedicated himself to architectural and masonic preservation.³² His inquiries about the "freemasons" to Dugdale and Wren were per-

²⁹ J. Evelyn, *Diary*, IV, 470-74.

³⁰ The work remained in MS. until 1847; see R. Gould, *History*, II, 128-31.

³¹ H. Colvin, "Aubrey's *Chronologia*," 5, 11.

³² J. Aubrey, *Brief Lives*, I, 83.

haps related to those of his friends Moray and Ashmole, who were then attempting similar research into masonic history. Like them, he merged occult with masonic studies. While writing the "Natural History," Aubrey also made notes on the Cabalistic significance of the Jewish pentalpha (used by Moray and Evelyn as a Mason's Mark), on Rosicrucian recipes for "Invisibility," and on the fertility and sexual rituals carried out by the Knights Templar and visitors to the Temple Church in London.³³

Aubrey and Ashmole may have urged Robert Plot to undertake further research into the role of masonry in England. Plot's interest in architecture and operative masonry had first been expressed in his book, *The Natural History of Oxfordshire* (1677), dedicated to Charles II. The frontispiece featured the masonic imagery of Minerva with compass, square, and tools—placed in front of Wren's Sheldonian Theater. He described the architectural designs of the Gothic buildings of the university and the methods of cutting and setting free-stone.³⁴ Perceiving architecture as part of a Christian-Cabalistic tradition of natural history, Plot drew on the works of Cardano, Dee, Fludd, and Hebrew scholars, as well as Wilkins and Wren.³⁵ For *The Natural History of Staffordshire* (1686), Plot drew further on Paracelsus, Van Helmont, Digby, and Kircher.³⁶ He revived the Solomonic tributes to the Stuart kings, praising James II as "Israel's King," for "tis by you/That we enjoy a happy Canaan too." Thus, his important account of English masonry occurred within a Hermetic-Cabalistic context.

What Plot found was a tradition that differed significantly from the "ancient," nationalistic, occasionally politicized Freemasonry of Scotland. He noted that the fraternity had spread all over England, but it was particularly strong in the moorlands in the south. This regional concentration of operative masons was associated with the location of stone quarries which, as Colvin notes, served as "nurseries of masons" during this period.³⁷ Plot recognized the value of

³³ John Aubrey, *Remains of Gentilisme and Judaisme* (London, 1688), 48, 51, 97. The MS. was completed by February 1687.

³⁴ Robert Plot, *The Natural History of Oxfordshire* (Oxford: The Theatre, 1677), 75–109, 268.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 229–32, 282, 343.

³⁶ Robert Plot, *The Natural History of Staffordshire* (Oxford: The Theatre, 1686), 11–13, 82–83.

³⁷ H. Colvin, *Biog. Dict.*, 22.

the secret signs used by “accepted masons” for regulating and improving the skills, integrity, and prestige of the craft. Though he “found persons of the most eminent quality, that did not disdain to be of this Fellowship,” he judged the local lodge histories (with their mythical and antiquarian claims) to be “false and incoherent.”³⁸ He also revealed that the English operative masons met mainly in occasional lodges, which were meetings rather than permanent halls, and still used a one-grade system of initiation.³⁹

Plot suspected that some of the masons’ secrets (“to which they are sworn after their fashion”) were much worse than secret signs or giving of gloves. He warned that it is “still to be feared these Chapters of Freemasons do as much mischief as before, which if one may estimate by the penalty, was anciently so great, that perhaps it might be usefull to examin them now.”⁴⁰ Plot’s concern was based mainly on the combinations of craftsmen who could raise prices—the point of the fourteenth- and sixteenth-century penalties against them. However, some readers of his book thought he hinted at potential conspiracies against the state. The moorland sites suggested the Scottish practice of meetings in isolated places, which evoked memories of the field conventicles of militant Covenanters. Stevenson remarks that “Plot’s suspicions have been echoed ever since: if freemasons insist on keeping so much secret, this must be because they are up to no good!”⁴¹

As a Catholic loyal to James II, his patron and friend, Plot possibly influenced the king to firm up masonic support in England, for a royalist Masonic initiative was subsequently undertaken. In 1686 a London Freemason made an elaborate, five-feet long transcript on parchment of the traditional constitutions of the Company of Accepted Masons.⁴² It featured the coats of arms of the royal family, the City of London, and the Masons’ Company (but not Rabbi Leon’s design). The initiated mason was charged to “keep truly all the Counsells of Lodge and Chamber, and of all other Counsells that ought to be kept by way of Masonrye.” He shall also be “true to God and holy Church,” be “a true liege man to the King of England without

³⁸ R. Plot, *Staffordshire*, 316–18.

³⁹ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 228–29.

⁴⁰ R. Plot, *Staffordshire*, 318.

⁴¹ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 224.

⁴² E. Conder, *Records*, 207, 215.

Treason or any falsehood,” and “warne the King or his Counsell” if he hears of any treason. Was this renewed stress on loyalty a response to *Caledonia’s Farewell*, the royalist manifesto of Scottish Masons? Or, was it a defensive measure, in response to the alleged linkage of Freemasons, radical Rosicrucians, and Dutch republicans in *Poor Robin’s Intelligencer*, and the implication of sedition in Plot’s *Natural History*?

Though Anderson claimed that James II was not a “Brother Mason,” his failure to mention the Masonic affiliation of Moray, Kincardine, and Lauderdale suggests that he was either unaware of or suppressed much seventeenth-century Scottish Masonic history. Thus, it is possible that James was initiated in Scotland during his residence there but did not associate himself with English Masonry. Eighteenth-century Jacobite Masons claimed that the Stuart kings always functioned as hereditary patrons of the Scottish craft. However, in England, James would soon revoke the charters of all the City companies, including the Masons, and require that they re-purchase them in order to raise funds for his government.⁴³

Significantly, he did not pursue this course in Scotland. In fact, he was probably aware of new royalist developments within Scottish Masonry, as suggested by an inscription carved by Alexander Thom on a second Masonic charter box: “God save the king and St Johns Lodge 1686.” Stevenson suggests that Thom joined a separate lodge from the Incorporation.⁴⁴ Was this a new chivalric lodge which developed rituals of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem (Hospitallers) or, more secretly, the Knights of the Temple? According to the eighteenth-century *Écossais* Rite of Clermont, it was in 1686 that William Bruce was succeeded by the Earl of Perth as head of the Templar-Masonic order.⁴⁵ Perth allegedly held this position until 1708. Despite the confused tradition, related by German Masons who knew little about Scottish history, their preservation of the names of David Ramsay, William Bruce, and the Earl of Perth suggests some historical plausibility in this oral heritage. As we shall see, various chivalric orders were perhaps conflated into “Templarism” by the later Masons.

Unfortunately, James II did not possess Masonic second sight, and he did not foresee the disastrous consequences of his efforts for

⁴³ E. Conder, *Hole Craft*, 232–33.

⁴⁴ D. Stevenson, *First Freemasons*, 76–77.

⁴⁵ W. Zimmerman, *Von den alten*, 375.

religious toleration in 1686–87. At his accession James promised to protect the Church of England, but he was also determined to establish liberty of conscience for Catholics, Dissenters, Quakers, and Jews. Throughout 1686 he released Dissenters and Quakers from jail, attended Quaker services, and reassured the Jewish community. However, in December, when he opened for public worship a new Catholic chapel in Whitehall, he became the target of revived anti-Papist fervor. The chapel was a magnificent work of art, replete with marble statuary, colored frescoes, and a glorious throne; it provided a rich theater in which bishops and priests could “create a world of mysterious ceremony.”⁴⁶ The staunchly Anglican Evelyn recorded with some dismay, “I would not have believed I should have seen such things in the King of England’s palace.” In the same month, Perth and Melfort celebrated their recent conversion to Catholicism (their mother’s faith) by opening a Catholic chapel in Edinburgh, where incensed mobs soon attacked the Papist abomination.

While opposition Whigs inflamed even royalist Anglicans with fears of Catholic subversion, James’s supporters sought alternative methods for funding his policies. At Oxford Plot tried to convince the king that he could finance his government by “an inexhaustible supply of gold from alchemical transmutations which would make parliaments permanently unnecessary.”⁴⁷ Plot counted on help from Ashmole, for the Hermetic gold factory would be located in the Ashmolean Museum, where it would be protected by Oxford’s royalist officials. Perhaps he hoped that Ashmole’s Rosicrucian and Masonic colleagues would assist in this project.

Encouraged by the support his moderate policies received earlier in Scotland, James issued a Declaration of Indulgence for the northern kingdom in February 1687. By this time, however, the royalist Evelyn believed much of the anti-Catholic propaganda of the Whigs, and he considered the Indulgence granted in Scotland to be an especially “Jesuitical” plot. On 2 March he recorded:

Came out a proclamation for universal liberty of conscience in Scotland, and dispensation from all tests and laws to the contrary, as also capacitating Papists to be chose into all positions of trust. The mystery [of Jesuitism] operates.⁴⁸

⁴⁶ F. Higham, *James II*, 257.

⁴⁷ M. Hunter, *Science*, 129.

⁴⁸ J. Evelyn, *Diary*, IV, 535–36.

Even more alarming was the Indulgence issued in England in April, when the king suspended the penal laws against Catholics and Dissenters. As Higham observes,

Political equality between men of all religions was to be accompanied by freedom of worship. Unfortunately, James, though he accomplished much, had only been able to do so by stretching his prerogative to the utmost. The legality of his piecemeal preferments and dispensations was at best questionable. He set his heart on the Parliamentary repeal of the Test and the Penal Laws which should give substance to what he had achieved in skeleton form.⁴⁹

The belief in “political equality between men of all religions” (within the lodges) would become the public creed of eighteenth-century Freemasonry. Thus, it is relevant that the lodge of Aberdeen recorded an egalitarian statement about this time (circa 1687). In its surviving “Mark Book,” a list of names and Mason’s Marks for its eclectic membership—ranging from noblemen to artisans—emphasized the equality maintained within the lodge:

... wee intreat all our good successores in ye measson craft to follow our Rule as yo’r patternes and not to stryve for place, for heir ye may sie above [i.e., the list] wr’n and amongst ye rest our names, persones of a meane degree insert be for great persones of qualitie.⁵⁰

In some ways, James’s Declaration of Indulgence was an extension of the Scottish tradition within the lodges, where the king and his masons (Protestant and Catholic) stood on the level. Unfortunately, it was launched into a Britain unable and unwilling to absorb it during his reign.

The complexity of the issue for Freemasonry was demonstrated by developments in Scotland, where royalist troops were ordered to arrest those Presbyterians who resisted the policy of toleration. In May 1687 the lodge of Dumfries was reorganized, after a period of internal dissention and quarreling, and in June several military officers were admitted as “no mechanicks” but as “gentlemen” Masons. These officers were “engaged in suppressing the religious dissidents in the southwest.”⁵¹ Stevenson observes that it is unclear whether the lodge

⁴⁹ F. Higham, *James II*, 257.

⁵⁰ R. Gould, *History*, II, 55; for the dating, see D. Stevenson, *First Freemasons*, 126–30.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 80–81.

was attempting to prove its loyalty by admitting the soldiers, or whether the soldiers were utilizing a loyalist lodge in their campaign to support the king's call for liberty of conscience. Later, after James lost his throne, the lodge refused to admit "non-operatives," and the lodge historian did not mention the royalist officers who had joined in 1687.

While the Scottish Parliament wrestled with the challenges of the Indulgence, the king prudently announced that the opening of free trade between Scotland and England would be "oure particular care."⁵² He perceived religious toleration as important to economic progress in France as well as Britain. In the wake of Louis XIV's revocation of the Edict of Nantes, thousands of French Protestants sought refuge in England in 1686–87. The Scottish royalist Ailesbury admired James's sympathetic and practical response to the influx:

Trade he had much at heart, and his topic was, liberty of conscience and many hands at work in trade; and that made him receive all the French Huguenots that were so inhumanely used and obliged to come out of France, and in my hearing exclaimed against the King his brother of France's severity.⁵³

Despite James's friendship with Louis XIV and his belief that the Huguenots were anti-monarchical, he continued to speak out against the persecution provoked by their religious faith.⁵⁴ Like James I and Charles II, he objected to all violence in the name of religion. In England he authorised a house-to-house collection in aid of the refugees, and he encouraged them to develop their industries and impart their skills to the English villagers among whom they settled.⁵⁵ Some Masonic historians suggest that refugee members of the *compagnonnage* infused elements of their Solomonic and Hiramite traditions into British Masonry.⁵⁶

Even John Evelyn, who believed the Indulgence was instigated by Jesuitical conspirators, admitted that it was popular among artisans

⁵² Ian Cowan, "The Reluctant Revolutionaries," in E. Cruickshanks, *By Force or Default*, 67.

⁵³ T. Bruce, *Memoirs of . . . Ailesbury*, I, 103–04.

⁵⁴ F. Higham, *James II*, 245; John Miller, "James II and Toleration," in E. Cruickshanks, *By Force or Default*, 8–27, and *Glorious Revolution*, 15–22.

⁵⁵ Robin Gwynne, "James II in the Light of His Treatment of Huguenot Refugees in England, 1685–1686," *English Historical Review*, 92 (1977), 820–33.

⁵⁶ See discussion by W. Harry Rylands, "A Word on the Legends of the *Compagnonnage*," *AQC*, 2 (1889), 52–71.

and merchants. On 12 June Evelyn was present with the king when officials from Coventry presented a large parchment address, signed by over a thousand citizens, in appreciation of James's "granting a liberty of conscience."⁵⁷ Evelyn recorded the presenter's claim that "this was not the application of one party only, but the unanimous address of Church of England men, Presbyterians, Independents, and Anabaptists." By removing "all dissensions and animosities," the policy of toleration would enable them to improve trade and develop future industry. A delighted James promised to establish toleration "by law, that it should never be altered by his successors."

Evelyn also noted that the Family of Love presented an address to James, who queried them about their beliefs and was convinced that "they were a kind of refined Quakers" (a compliment, given James's admiration for William Penn and his followers). As discussed earlier, the Familist policy of public loyalty to the established religion while maintaining private liberty of conscience has been considered proto-Masonic by many historians. From a modern standpoint, James's declarations of toleration seem humane and enlightened. However, the endemic anti-Catholicism of most British Protestants led them to interpret his policy as a Papist plot. James's unwise publication of two letters written by Charles II to explain his Catholic conversion reinforced those fears. Many Anglicans believed that the king's policy undermined the national church, and they communicated their concerns to Episcopalians in Scotland.

Despite their declining numbers, James's partisans in Scotland still hoped that he would fulfill his promises of patronage and funding for important projects. In order to honor their loyalty, the Earl of Melfort persuaded James to officially revive the Order of the Thistle by issuing from Windsor a patent for restitution on 29 May 1687. Probably drafted by Melfort, the patent reiterated Mackenzie's claims for the priority and Franco-Scottish origins of the Thistle. It also linked the order firmly to pre-Reformation Stuart traditions, especially through its praise of Mary Queen of Scots:

... the said most Ancient and most Noble Order of the Thistle continued in great glory and splendour for many hundreds of years ... until the unfortunate rebellion against his Majesty's royal great grandmother Mary Queen of Scots (of most pious and glorious memory), at which

⁵⁷ J. Evelyn, *Diary*, IV, 553–54.

time the splendour both of church and monarch fell together into contempt, and the most noble Order, with all its ornaments, and rites, and ceremonies, was extinguished . . .⁵⁸

That Melfort was a Freemason sheds light on the striking similarities between the oath taken by the "Knights-brethren" of the Thistle and Masonic brethren. The new knight vowed loyalty to his sovereign and his companions and vowed to defend the Christian religion. Like the royalist Mason in London who produced the parchment scroll in 1686, the knight vowed, "I shall never bear treason in my heart against my Lord the King, but shall discover the same." The knights claimed that the oath repeated the thirteenth-century vow promulgated by Robert the Bruce. Of the eight founding knights, four were Catholic, three Protestant, and one a Catholic convert to Presbyterianism; all had assisted James in issuing his First Declaration of Indulgence.⁵⁹ James and Melfort were perhaps influenced by the Masonic tradition of secrecy about lodge proceedings (reiterated in the 1686 scroll), for the king ordered that the register and records of the Thistle be kept separate from the papers of the secretary of state.⁶⁰

In winter 1687–88 it was widely rumored that the king planned to re-visit Scotland in order to be crowned James VII at Scone. Thus, there was a renewal of royalist architectural activity connected with the expected coronation and launching of the Order of the Thistle. In order to provide a suitable meeting place for the Thistle knights, the king ordered William Bruce and James Smith, now Master of Works, to supervise the repair and ornamentation of Holyrood Chapel. According to a contemporary report, it was "fitted up by the Hands of many exquisite workmen foreign and domestic, who adorned the same with Effigies of our Saviour, his twelve Apostles, and other admirable pieces of Sculpture."⁶¹ A later visitor described the outstanding architectural features of the chapel, which had "the highest roof I have seen, the pillars as exquisite as St. George's Chapel at Windsor, with two rows of stone galleries above."

In May 1688 James issued a second Declaration of Indulgence, which provided new excuses for anti-Catholic attacks in England and

⁵⁸ N.H. Nicholas, *The Statutes of the Order of the Thistle* (London: William Pickering, 1828), [ii].

⁵⁹ Matthew Glozier, "The Earl of Melfort, the Court Catholic Party and the Foundation of the Order of the Thistle," *SHR*, 79 (2000), 233–38.

⁶⁰ A. Nisbet, *Heraldry*, 118.

⁶¹ M. Linklater and C. Hesketh, *For King*, 80, 123–24.

Scotland. Against this background, the publication by the English royalist Randle Holme of *An Academie of Armoury* (1688), with its praise of Freemasonry, suggests an infusion of Scottish-style Masonry into the lodge at Chester, located on the northwest border between England and Wales. A strategically important garrison town, from which troops passed between England and Ireland, Chester was home to many royalists and Catholics.⁶² Thus, there was possibly an infusion of military masonry from Scots-Irish visitors. Holme was a genealogist and herald, and he included the tools of the masons' trade among illustrations for coats of arms, adding the comment, "I cannot but Honor the Fellowship of the Masons, because of its Antiquity; and the more, as being a Member of that Society, called Free-Masons."⁶³ Among Holme's papers was a membership list and a copy of the Old Charges. Stevenson observes that,

This looks not dissimilar to some Scottish lodges, with the first members who were not operative masons being drawn from the other building crafts . . . Here, at last, in these Chester references there is evidence that appears to describe an institution rather than a meeting of freemasons, something similar to an early Scottish—or modern lodge—of freemasons, though the word lodge is not used.⁶⁴

Holme may have sensed a connection between Masonic and Familist ideals, for he copied the Plantin Press emblem—a hand holding compasses above the motto "Constantia et Labore"—from some documents dated 1621 and July 1639.⁶⁵

At the same time, in May 1688, James's Indulgence provoked a different reaction in Edinburgh. It was probably political polarization as well as trade quarrels that motivated a group of masons in Edinburgh to withdraw from the royalist lodge of Mary's Chapel. Robert Lindsay records that the seceders "hived off . . . by swarms" and organized a new lodge of North Leith on 29 May.⁶⁶ Mary's Chapel condemned the seceders and issued "futile bluster about the

⁶² Eveline Cruickshanks, *By Force or Default*, 35–37, and *Glorious Revolution*, 29.

⁶³ Douglas Knoop, G.P. Jones, and Douglas Hamer, *Early Masonic Pamphlets* (London: Q.C. Correspondence Circle, 1978), 34.

⁶⁴ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 224–25.

⁶⁵ British Library: MSS. Harley 1927.f.76; mentioned in Ron Heisler, "The Impact of Freemasonry on Elizabethan Literature," *HJ* (1990), 52.

⁶⁶ Robert Lindsay, *A History of the Mason Lodge of Holyrood House (St. Luke's)*, Number 44 (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1935), I, 27.

mason law and establishment of lodges requiring either royal consent . . . or permission from a general warden."⁶⁷ Though Stevenson notes that such requirements never existed, it is possible that James and his masonic partisans were determined to exert more control over the craft, as the king issued an ambitious charter to the Town Council for the building of new streets and bridges.

While James outlined his architectural agenda, he continued his support of virtuoso culture by founding a new university in Edinburgh, whose professors praised his "sincere and fatherly care and Royal zeall for propagating learning so necessarie and profitable both to church and state." John Cockburn, an optimistic Episcopalian minister, published the first edition of his magazine, *Bibliotheca Universalis* (1688), containing articles from European learned periodicals, and he envisioned an international intellectual outreach from James's northern kingdom. Ouston observes that the king's enlightened policies were based on his confidence that Scotland was loyal and grateful:

The Charter was intended to make Edinburgh a fitting capital for the Royalist aristocracy . . . Although these intentions were not fulfilled, the initiative which they represented was to contribute through individuals and institutions to the society of eighteenth-century Edinburgh in which the Enlightenment took root.⁶⁸

Unfortunately, the heavy-handed actions of several Catholics whom James appointed to official positions disrupted these promising projects, just when the Whigs became most threatened by an unexpected royal birth.

On 10 June 1688 Queen Mary delivered a baby boy, James, Prince of Wales—an event which shocked the Protestant opposition into a radical new course. Bishop Gilbert Burnet, now a supporter of the Whigs, spread false stories that there was no Stuart birth but that an infant was brought from outside in a warming pan. Radical Protestants then published broadsheets accusing Edward Petre, James's Jesuit confidante, of practising black magic and fathering the baby on a nun!⁶⁹ Of such fables are revolutions made. At The Hague Burnet convinced James's daughters, the Protestant princesses Mary and Anne, that the birth was fraudulent. The controversy about the

⁶⁷ D. Stevenson, *First Freemasons*, 41.

⁶⁸ H. Ouston, "York in Edinburgh," 153.

⁶⁹ D. Mitchell, *Jesuits*, 165.

legitimacy of the king's own succession was thus heightened, and various Whigs and Anglican bishops secretly communicated to Prince William of Orange, Mary's husband and James's nephew, their desire for him to replace James on the throne. These turbulent events provide the context for a comical account of Freemasonry presented at Trinity College, Dublin, soon after Prince James's birth. That Jonathan Swift contributed to the satire lends it a special significance in Masonic literary history.

As a witty and irreverent student at Trinity, Swift contributed to a satirical *Tripes* composed by his friends for the Commencement ceremonies on 11 July 1688.⁷⁰ The *Tripes* was named for the three-legged stool upon which the university jester sat in medieval times, and it furnished comic relief during the scholastic disquisitions delivered by candidates for degrees. At Trinity the satire was written by a group or club of students, and the occasion drew a large audience of university officials, military officers, and fashionable ladies and gentlemen. In 1688 the authors especially aimed their satire at the virtuosos of the Dublin Philosophical Society, whose useless and manic experimentation were mocked via references to Butler's *Hudibras*, Buckingham's *Rehearsal*, and Shadwell's *Virtuoso*.⁷¹ More explicitly than their English models, Swift and his fellow comics linked the New Science to Freemasonry, which was portrayed as a contributor to the eager innovations and frenetic activities characteristic of virtuoso culture.

The students drew upon their observations of—and probable participation in—the Masonic lodge at Trinity College, which had been established some years earlier during a period of active college building.⁷² Designed by “the craftsman-architect” Thomas Lucas, the main front and central portion of Trinity reflected recent trends in Parisian architecture.⁷³ According to the *Tripes*, among many new requirements for Trinity,

⁷⁰ The case for Swift's contribution is presented persuasively by George Mayhew, in “Swift and the Tripes Tradition,” *Philological Quarterly*, 45 (1966), 85–101.

⁷¹ Jonathan Swift, *The Works of Jonathan Swift*, ed. Sir Walter Scott (Edinburgh: Archibald Constable, 1824), VI, 240, 255, 259.

⁷² J. Lepper and P. Crossle, *History*, I, 36–37.

⁷³ R. Loeber, “Early Classicism in Ireland,” *AH* 22 (1979), 58.

It was lately ordered, that, for the honour and dignity of the University, there should be introduced a society of Freemasons, consisting of gentlemen, mechanics, porters, parsons, ragmen, hucksters, coblers, poets, justices, drawers, beggars, aldermen, paviours, sculls, freshmen, bachelors, scavengers, masters, sow-gelders, doctors, ditchers, pimps, lords, butchers, tailors, who shall bind themselves by an oath, never to discover their mighty no-secret; and to relieve whatsoever strolling distressed brethren they meet with, after the example of the fraternity of Freemasons in and about Trinity College; by whom a collection was lately made for, and the purse of charity well stuffed for, a reduced brother, who received their charity as follows in this list of benefactors.⁷⁴

While some benefactors gave a pair of old shoes, a bundle of godly ballads, or a slice of Cheshire cheese, "Sir Warren" gave five shillings "for being freemasonized the new way." Irish Masonic historians consider this a reference to speculative rituals that went beyond the basic requirements of operative initiation. Hinting at a Caledonian Masonic influence on the "new" Masonry, the *Tripos* described a Scots-Irish gentleman—"Sir Fitzsimons, who always dropt after, (as our town of Berwick-upon Tweed) into a thistle, which still retains its primitive roughness"—and quoted the Scottish historian Buchanan.⁷⁵ James II's recent revival of the Order of the Thistle, which included Scottish Masons among its knights, may be relevant. Could the gift of "a pair of cast night gloves" hint at the medieval knight's cast-iron glove or gauntlet that eighteenth-century critics interpreted as the origin of the gift of leather gloves?

Swift and his club exploited the sinister rumors about Freemasonry in their portrayal of "the admirable Ridley" as an initiated brother. Notorious as a spy and informer who made his living "by betraying Catholic priests to their doom under the inhuman penal laws," Ridley was embalmed and stuffed after his death.⁷⁶ His body was hung in the Trinity College library, where the medical students examined it and noticed that "the Freemasons' mark" was branded on his buttocks. In "An Elegy Upon Ridley," the *Tripos* authors lamented:

Unhappy brother, what can be
In wretchedness compared to thee,
Thou grief and shame of our society!
Had we in due time understood

⁷⁴ J. Swift, *Works*, VI, 242–43.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, VI, 247–48.

⁷⁶ J.E.S. Tuckett, "The French-Irish Family of Walsh," *AQC*, 38 (1925), 190.

That thou were of the brotherhood,
 By fraud or force thou had'st got loose
 From shameful tree and dismal noose:
 An now perhaps with life been blest,
 A comely brother as the best,
 Not thus exposed a monumental jest;
 When lady longs for college beer,
 Or little dame or country squire
 Walk out an afternoon, to look
 On thee, and devil-raising book;
 Who kindly rather chose to die,
 Than blemish our fraternity;
 The first of us e'er hang'd for modesty.⁷⁷

These sly hints at magical practices among the Freemasons were followed by the narrator's hint at sexual horseplay, when he concluded good-naturedly that "the Freemasons will banish me their lodge, and bar me the happiness of kissing long Lawrence."

The references to Masonry appeared within a context of political satire upon the polarized politics of Trinity and Dublin in 1688. Despite composing the vast majority of the Irish population, Catholics were not allowed to attend Trinity, which was controlled by the Anglican church. Some Protestants protested the attempt of the royal government to force the university to accept "the infamous Bernard Doyle" as a Fellow, merely "on the merit of conforming to the religion of James II."⁷⁸ When Doyle refused to take the Anglican religious oath, his critics charged him with debauchery, drunkenness, and theft. The university then resisted the king's order, and Doyle spread slanders about the Trinity authorities. In the *Tripes*, the students made obscene allusions to Doyle's mistress Nelly, who was said to like a man "on the prick of preferment" and who has "mandrakes from the King." Doyle's tattered and filthy breeches were given Masonic associations: "By their shreds of all nations, you would have thought they belonged to one of the Freemasons that built Babel."

The satirists also hinted at larger targets. While under attack, Doyle petitioned Richard Talbot, First Earl of Tyrconnell, for support. Though James had maintained Protestants in the role of Lord Lieutenant for two years, in 1687 he appointed Tyrconnell, an Irish Catholic, to the post, and the latter's opening up of positions for native Catholics

⁷⁷ J. Swift, *Works*, VI, 244–45.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, VI, 248–52.

intensified the fears of the more militant Anglicans and Presbyterians.⁷⁹ From London, James repeatedly sent orders that his Irish Protestant subjects be treated fairly and that no one should be deprived of office because of religion. However, bitter grudges on all sides undermined this attempt at enlightened royal policy—a policy opposed by Swift as undermining the Anglican hegemony. The Trinity students were also aware of Tyrconnell's great interest in Palladian architecture, which he expressed in ambitious building projects.⁸⁰ Corp suggests that the Third Earl of Tyrconnell's membership in the Jacobite lodge in Paris in 1726 was based on family tradition.⁸¹ Thus, the *Tripes* authors may have indirectly targeted Tyrconnell among their eclectic Masonic crew.

Further political jibes were made against Sir Michael Creagh, an outspoken supporter of King James. Creagh boasted to a rival alderman about the birth of the Prince of Wales: "We have a brave young prince, and the world's our own." In order to silence rumors about the warming-pan substitution, Creagh had ordered a day of general celebration for the royal birth which included distribution of wine to the citizens of Dublin.⁸² In the *Tripes*, the alderman accepts the drink but raises questions about Creagh's own legitimacy. The narrator recognized that he was treading on dangerous ground, and he followed this scene with a defensive explanation that he brought all these characters out "for nothing at all, as Mr Bayes did his beasts" (in Buckingham's *Rehearsal*). Just what Swift's attitude was to Freemasonry is difficult to determine, given the satirical license and public performance of the skit. At the end, the narrator announced regretfully that "If I betake myself to the library, Ridley's ghost will haunt me, for scandalizing him with the name of free-mason," and the brothers "will banish me their lodge."

Despite his plea of comic tradition, the narrator—John Jones, a close friend of Swift—was punished severely by Trinity authorities "for false and scandalous reflections in his *Tripes*." John Barrett, who first discovered the manuscript of the *Tripes* in Trinity archives,

⁷⁹ E. Cruickshanks, *Glorious Revolution*, 54–55.

⁸⁰ R. Loeber, "Early Classicism," 56–57.

⁸¹ Edward Corp, ed., *Lord Burlington—The Man and His Politics* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1998), 11, 20. The Third Earl was Richard Talbot, great-great nephew of the First Earl; he became a prominent military officer in France.

⁸² G. Mayhew, "Swift and *Tripes*," 95.

argued that Swift was the major contributor, if not the sole author, of the satire.⁸³ Moreover, he concluded that Swift was also punished and forced to leave the university in January 1689. The experience was instructive for Swift, who tried to cover up the affair. As he began writing *The Tale of a Tub*, which further satirized religious sectarians and Rosicrucian virtuosos, he refined and developed the techniques of the *Tripes* in order to more carefully conceal his encoded political and Masonic allusions.

In the seven months between the rollicking *Tripes* and Swift's exit from Trinity, the fate of James II's government underwent dramatic changes. Reinforcing the radical Presbyterians in Scotland, a secret coalition of Whigs and Anglicans urged William of Orange to come to London and take over the government. Hoping to gain England's assistance in his war against Louis XIV, William issued a manifesto which catalogued James's alleged misdeeds and questioned the legitimacy of the Prince of Wales. James was shocked and incredulous at the disloyalty of his daughter and son-in-law, and he was ill-prepared to deal with William's invasion of England in November 1688. Despite William's public claims that he had no designs on the throne and was only interested in protecting Protestantism, he had long planned the invasion—with a powerful army in which his Catholic mercenaries outnumbered James's Catholic troops.⁸⁴

In Scotland, rebellious Whigs—inflamed by anti-Catholic propaganda—went on iconoclastic rampages, in which they especially targeted monuments of Papist architecture. In November “the rabble” attacked Roslin Castle and Chapel, where they defaced many of the Gothic sculptures so admired by Freemasons.⁸⁵ Alarmed by these developments, Balcarres and Claverhouse travelled to London, where they urged James to mount an armed resistance against the Dutch “usurper.” The king was greatly moved by their loyalty, and he made Claverhouse Viscount Dundee. However, the Scots became worried about James's confusion and languor, which Balcarres's

⁸³ John Barrett, *An Essay on the Earlier Life of Jonathan Swift* (London, 1808), 13, 20–21.

⁸⁴ E. Cruickshanks, *Glorious Revolution*, 23–25; Jonathan Israel, *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and Its World Impact* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991), 1–13.

⁸⁵ R. Hay, *Genealogie*, 107.

daughter attributed to a burst vessel in his head brought on by stress.⁸⁶ Usually described as a nosebleed or cowardly hypochondria, the burst vessel may have indicated a mild stroke—which would explain James's strangely altered behavior in the months ahead.

Balcarres and Dundee tried to rally the Scottish nobles in London, and they produced a letter from the Secret Committee in Edinburgh urging a royalist campaign. When the king was captured while trying to escape, he was brought back to London and placed under armed Dutch guard. Nevertheless, he was able to meet privately with Balcarres and Dundee. He commissioned the former to manage civil affairs in Scotland and the latter to serve as Commander-in-Chief of the Scottish army. In the meantime, James would plan a second escape in hopes of finding refuge and support in France. As "usurpers" took over the restored "temple" of British governance, a second Stuart diaspora commenced. The king's flight in December 1688 launched the international Jacobite movement and, according to Franco-Swedish-German Masonic traditions, an innovative system of *Écossais* Freemasonry—a system that developed increasingly "speculative" rituals of Cabalistic, Hermetic, and chivalric mysticism. Though there is no surviving contemporary documentation, references to a lodge formed by Jacobite partisans at St. Germain in 1688–89 appeared frequently in eighteenth-century writings.⁸⁷ By examining the Scots-Irish context of this Masonic initiative, we can provide historical plausibility for an otherwise vague tradition.

Despite the Masonic broadside issued in support of James VII and II in 1685, the Edinburgh Masons became increasingly polarized over his religious policies. When William invaded in November, James Smith—Master of Works and convert to Protestantism—abandoned James's cause and informed against his patron, the Earl of Perth. A surprised and disappointed Perth lamented that few, however much obliged, stuck by him now: "Even James Smith, who had starved had it not been for me and to whom I had got a gifte . . . has played the rogue and pretended he saw papers by me, which God

⁸⁶ M. Linklater and C. Hesketh, *For King*, 146–48.

⁸⁷ See Bernard Fay, "Les origines et l'esprit de la Franc-Maçonnerie," *La Revue Universelle*, 66 (1936), 170; Pierre Chevallier, *Histoire de la Franc-Maçonnerie* (Paris: Fayard, 1974), I, 4–5; Phillipe Morbach, "Les régiments écossais et irlandais à St. Germain-en-Laye: mythe ou réalité maçonnique?" in Edward Corp, ed., *L'autre exil: Les Jacobites en France au début de XVIII-siècle* (Montpellier, 1993), 143–55.

knows I never had.”⁸⁸ Smith’s father-in-law Robert Mylne also acquiesced in the new regime, thus revealing further breaches in Masonic loyalty. Their longtime friend Sir William Bruce, who facilitated Monk’s organization of the Restoration, remained loyal to James II. He would subsequently lose all official employment and be repeatedly imprisoned. Lord St. Clair, still considered the hereditary patron of the Masons, also remained loyal and joined Bruce, Perth, and Balcarres in royalist resistance.⁸⁹

James’s flight in December emboldened his enemies in Edinburgh, who overpowered the royalist guard at Holyrood, where they desecrated the tombs of Scottish kings and sacked the chapel. The mob was especially determined to destroy “all the curious workmanship” that James had ordered for the Order of the Thistle, and “several parcels of these Pieces of work” were burned at the Cross of Edinburgh.⁹⁰ The Earl of Melfort, founding member of the order, had already fled to France, and he was followed by his fellow Thistle knights—the earls of Seaforth and Dunbarton.⁹¹ Dunbarton had earlier refused to give up his regiment of Tangerine veterans to the Williamite government and instead marched them north to serve James.⁹² The Earl of Perth, first initiate of the Thistle, was caught in his attempted flight and imprisoned in Stirling Castle until 1693, when he escaped to France.

At St. Germain Melfort and his allies were joined by Scottish and Irish soldiers from the French army, and together they pressured Louis XIV to support James militarily. Corp argues that Melfort and the Drummond family played an important role in introducing Freemasonry to France.⁹³ They allegedly introduced rituals of the Order of the Thistle (now suppressed in Scotland) into the military lodges, especially the degree of “Knight of St. Andrew of the Thistle.”⁹⁴ In so doing, they would implement the call by George Mackenzie, historian of the Thistle, for “pride in a cast of aristocratic warriors who

⁸⁸ J. Macaulay, “Seventeenth-century Genesis,” 16.

⁸⁹ Colin Lindsay, Third Earl of Balcarres, *Memoirs of the Revolution in Scotland, 1688–1690*. Bannatyne Club, 71 (Edinburgh, 1841), 35.

⁹⁰ A. Nisbet, *System of Heraldry*, II, 123.

⁹¹ N. Nicholas, *Statutes*, xi.

⁹² E. Cruickshanks, “Revolution,” 32.

⁹³ E. Corp, “Melfort,” 46.

⁹⁴ According to a member of the Swedish Rite, C.C.F.W. von Nettelblad; see his *Geschichte Freimaurerische Systeme in England, Frankreich, und Deutschland* (1879; facs. rpt. Wiesbaden, 1972), 112–23.

preserved freedom intact against foreign invaders and domestic tyrants.”⁹⁵ Later *Écossais* Masons also claimed that a Templar rite was established in 1688 and that a lodge was established within the château of St-Germain.⁹⁶ Bord argues that the Jacobites at St. Germain revived the political-military Masonic strategy utilized earlier by the exiled Charles II—i.e., they introduced Masonic organization and formed a political party within each regiment.⁹⁷ The Scots-Irish regiments then became “les agents exécutifs” and their lodges “le pouvoir directeur” of the Stuart cause.

Meanwhile in London, Balcarres drew upon his earlier friendship and kinship (through his first Dutch wife) with William of Orange and tried to persuade him to restore James. Failing to move the intransigent “usurper,” Balcarres and Dundee set off for Edinburgh in January 1689. When the Scottish Convention met in March to debate the succession, they pleaded eloquently for James’s cause. But their opponents arranged for William’s tactful declaration, which promised support for the “true religion” and peaceful policies, to be read first, while James’s royalist manifesto, which promised toleration but threatened retaliation, was read last. Balcarres and Dundee were dismayed that their own conciliatory advice to James had been over-ridden by the Catholic Melfort.

When they realized that the Williamite vote was growing, they planned a rival convention at Stirling Castle, where the Tenth Earl of Mar was governor and well disposed.⁹⁸ Dundee scaled the precipitous cliff of Edinburgh Castle to firm up the resolution of the Catholic Duke of Gordon to hold it for the king. However, at Stirling Dundee learned that the elderly and ill Mar, a patron of the Masonic

⁹⁵ Colin Kidd, *Subverting Scotland's Past* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993), 27.

⁹⁶ Albert Lantoin, *Histoire de la Franc-Maçonnerie Française*, 2nd rev. ed., ed. Daniel Ligou (Paris: Slatkin, 1981), 132. Also, Edward Corp and Eveline Cruickshanks, eds., *The Stuart Court in Exile and the Jacobites* (London: Hambledon, 1995), xxiii; they note that the earliest recorded lodge in Paris (1726) was “almost entirely composed of Jacobites who had been brought up at Saint-Germain, who had fathers and uncles who had been very close to James II and James III, and who were themselves living in the Château de Saint-Germain when their lodge was established.” Sons, grandsons, and nephews of the Drummond, Middleton, FitzJames, Dillon, Douglas (Dunbarton), and Talbot (Tyrconnell) families were initiates and apparently carried on inherited traditions; see E. Corp, *Burlington*, 20–21.

⁹⁷ Gustave Bord, *La Franc-Maçonnerie en France de Origines à 1815* (1908; facs. rpt. Paris: Slatkine, 1985), I, 51.

⁹⁸ M. Linklater and C. Hesketh, *For King*, 154–59.

“apostate” James Smith, had withdrawn his support and gone over to the new government. It was a decision that would have ramifying consequences for his son, John Erskine, who as Eleventh Earl of Mar would become a talented architect, Masonic leader, and Williamite-turned-Jacobite. Dundee managed to escape to the Highlands, but Balcarres was captured and imprisoned in Edinburgh. When Dundee marched north, he conferred with Alexander Drummond of Balhaldie, a Mason who would later head a Jacobite lodge.⁹⁹

In March Dundee learned that James had arrived in Ireland and was organizing a royalist army, so he rallied the loyal clans with promises of Irish reinforcements. From Dublin Melfort sent encouraging reports of local Jacobite successes and future support for the Highland army. Though James’s Irish Parliament passed legislation ensuring “Liberty of Conscience,” Dundee worried that anti-Papist propaganda against Melfort, as well as the earl’s unpopular “meddling,” was undermining the king’s position in Scotland.¹⁰⁰ He tried to convince Melfort’s opponents of the earl’s “real designs of living, and letting live, every one in their own way in matters of religion,” but he also urged Melfort to voluntarily remove himself as James’s secretary for Scotland. Then, the royalists could re-build public confidence in the king’s declarations of religious toleration. Meanwhile in Ireland, many veterans from Fitzgerald’s Tangerine regiment enlisted in the Jacobite army, and a group of Irish officers travelled to Scotland to join Dundee’s “honest men.”¹⁰¹

After the Scottish Convention declared for William and Mary on 11 April, Dundee raised the Stuart standard on a hill overlooking Dundee. On 27 July he led his troops on a furious Highland charge down the precipitous pass of Killiecrankie, where he scored a resounding victory over the superior Williamite forces. However, at day-break, his “confidential friend” Balcarres was startled in his Edinburgh prison cell by a vision of the ghost of Dundee, and he subsequently learned that the viscount had been killed.¹⁰² Balcarres recorded that an officer found a bundle of Dundee’s papers and commissions on the field, which included a letter from Melfort reporting that he had

⁹⁹ “The Early Minute Book of the Lodge of Dundee,” *AQC*, 67 (1955), 110.

¹⁰⁰ E. Cruickshanks, *Glorious Revolution*, 56; Andrew M. Scott, ed., “Letters of John Graham of Claverhouse,” *Miscellany of Scottish Historical Society*, 11 (1990), 240–65.

¹⁰¹ J. Riley, “Catholicism,” 12.

¹⁰² A. Lindsay, *Lives of Lindsays*, 170.

sent James's declaration of "not only an indemnity, but a toleration of all persuasions."

On the battlefield, Dundee's body was stripped, but his clothes and armor were later given to his brother David Graham, who survived the fight. According to the early eighteenth-century writers Jacob van Lennep, Abbé de Buisson, and Dom Calvet, Dundee was wearing a Templar cross, emblematic of his role as Grand Master of the Scottish Order of the Temple.¹⁰³ Some nineteenth-century Masons believed that this incident revealed the survival and merging of the Templars into Jacobite Freemasonry. John Graham was an expert in military mathematics and David served as quartermaster in his brother's regiment, which makes plausible their association with military masonry. Moreover, the city of Dundee was an ancient stronghold of royalist Masonry. Stevenson points out that during Viscount Dundee's residence, there were two levels of Masonry—the public Society of Masons and the secret lodge of Dundee—which were different aspects of the same organization.¹⁰⁴

The viscount was interested in chivalric orders, and he had earlier written Queensbury about his joy at the defeat of the Turks outside Vienna—an international Christian victory which recalled earlier heroic crusades.¹⁰⁵ Moreover, the Dundee Masons claimed chivalric origins and traditions, which were disrupted by Cromwellian persecution. According to a lodge history written in 1745,

About the year 1160, David, Earl of Huntington, a younger son of King David, did arrive in Dundee from the Holy Warr, erected a Lodge there, procured them charters, and was himself their Master . . . That this lodge in virtue of their rights continued down to the fatal storming of the town by General Monk in September 1651, when all the rights and charters of this Lodge, with many other valuable things, were lost and destroyed; and that ever since that time they had been in use of continuing the said Lodge, and to enter apprentices, pass fellows of the craft, and raise master masons therein.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰³ See the attributions in the anonymous *Memoirs of the Lord Viscount Dundee* (1843), 52–53; *Statutes of the order of the Temple* (Edinburgh, 1843), xv–xvi; John Yarker, "The Unrecognized Lodges and Degrees of Freemasonry before and after 1717," *AQC*, 1 (1887–88), 108; George Draffen, "The Alleged Templar Chapter at Edinburgh in 1745," *AQC*, 67 (1955), 57; M. Baigent and R. Leigh, *Temple*, 228–334, 376–77.

¹⁰⁴ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 195.

¹⁰⁵ A. Scott, "Letters of . . . Claverhouse," 211.

¹⁰⁶ R. Gould, *History*, II, 61.

As noted earlier, David I and his family were great admirers of the Templars, whom they employed in religious and financial positions. Thus, it is possible that a new degree bearing a chivalric title (Knight Templar) was developed in the secret lodge of Dundee.

While William III's troops steadily suppressed the Jacobite resistance in the north, David Graham managed to escape imprisonment in 1690. He fled to France, where he allegedly carried the Templar regalia and received his brother's title from James. According to some *Écossais* Masons, Dundee's Templar order continued surreptitiously in Scotland, but unfortunately no contemporary documents survive. In 1692 James II honored the family's chivalric ideals by making the exiled David Graham, Third Viscount Dundee, a Knight of the Thistle.¹⁰⁷ The king obviously believed that the continuance or revival of chivalric orders was important for building morale and fraternity among his embattled supporters.

Like Ashmole and Lilly, James probably saw the Templars and Knights of Malta as brothers, and he now took a renewed interest in the latter order. While he was in Dublin and attempting to link his Irish campaign with Dundee's in Scotland, he wrote to the Grand Master of Malta and obtained permission to revive in Britain the Grand Priory of the Knights of Malta.¹⁰⁸ His efforts were supported by Tyrconnell, who since 1687 had worked on plans to restore to the Knights Hospitallers their ancient Priory at Kilmainham, which now housed a royal military hospital.¹⁰⁹ James obtained the appointment of his natural son FitzJames as Grand Prior and gave him command of an Irish regiment. As an experienced mid-shipman and naval enthusiast, FitzJames shared the admiration of Louis XIV for the training and expertise of the seafaring Knights of Malta, whom he recruited to staff the French navy. Among James's soldiers in Ireland was James St. Clair of Roslin, son of the Tangerine veteran and Freemason who had earlier lived with the French Grand Prior of the Knights of Malta.¹¹⁰

FitzJames was befriended by Melfort, a Mason and Thistle knight, and the two men possibly collaborated in the infusion of chivalric

¹⁰⁷ E. Corp, *Burlington*, 23. John Graham's infant son, the Second Viscount, died in December 1689. David Graham died obscurely in France ca. 1700.

¹⁰⁸ H. Sire, *Knights of Malta*, 125–26, 187–88.

¹⁰⁹ E.J. King and the Earl of Scarbrough, *The Grand Priory of the Order of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem in England* (London: St. John's Gate, 1924), 65.

¹¹⁰ R. Hay, *Genealogie*, 165.

ideals into the Jacobite field lodges.¹¹¹ As noted earlier, Swift would refer to lodges of the Knights of Malta, and FitzJames continued to serve as Grand Prior of Britain until 1701. His exiled family would subsequently play a leading role in Jacobite Freemasonry in France.¹¹² One of the king's most ardent supporters was the Irish officer James Walsh, who reportedly established a lodge within his regiment on 25 March 1688.¹¹³ A new regiment, composed of Irish and Scottish soldiers, was raised by the Seventh Viscount Dillon, who agreed to send it to France in exchange for Louis XIV's troops bound for Ireland. Led by the viscount's son Arthur Dillon, the troops arrived in France in May 1690, and Dillon allegedly established a regimental lodge at St. Germain. Many French historians view these Stuart military lodges as the roots of *Écossais* or chivalric Masonry on the Continent.¹¹⁴ Like the FitzJameses, the Walsh and Dillon families would play active roles in the lodges of the Stuart diaspora.

Meanwhile in London, William III recognized that without Dundee's leadership the Scottish rising was doomed. While his troops continued to harass the royalists and Highlanders, Gaelic bards and Latin poets extolled the heroism and loyalty of "Bonnie Dundee," who embodied an ancient and now disappearing Scottish culture. Dr. Archibald Pitcairne, a Jacobite physician, published an eloquent Latin epitaph upon Dundee, which was then "English'd by Mr. Dryden" under the title, "Upon the Death of the Earl of Dundee:

O last and best of *Scots!* who didst maintain
Thy Country's Freedom from a Foreign Reign;
New People fill the Land now thou art gone,
New Gods the Temples, and new Kings the Throne.
Scotland and thou did each in other live,
Thou wouldst not her, nor could she survive;
Farewell! who living didst support the State,
And couldst not fall but with thy Country's Fate.¹¹⁵

As a confidante of Dundee's friend George Mackenzie, who was then in London, was Dryden aware of Dundee's alleged role as

¹¹¹ On FitzJames and Melfort, see *The Journal of John Stevens*, ed. Robert H. Murray (Oxford: Clarendon, 1912), 72–73.

¹¹² E. Corp, *Burlington*, 10–11, 20–21.

¹¹³ J. Tuckett, "Walsh," 189–96.

¹¹⁴ P. Chevallier, *Histoire*, I, 5; P. Morbach, "Les régiments," 143–44; A. Lantoine, *Histoire*, 105, 127, 132.

¹¹⁵ J. Dryden, *Works*, III, 222.

Master of the now suppressed “Temples”—lodges of the revived Order of the Temple?

While the structure of Solomonic kingship crumbled before the Dutch conqueror, the Jewish community in London was placed in a precarious position. Having benefited from the protection of the Stuart kings, they waited anxiously to see if William III would extend traditional Dutch toleration to his new kingdom. In March 1689 their insecurity was reinforced by a Jacobite Dissenter who issued a pamphlet claiming that William would overthrow liberty of conscience in England, in alliance with the Church of England, “by which means all conscientious Dissenters will, with the Jews, be again forced to take their retreat” to Amsterdam.¹¹⁶

It was well known that William had long relied on Jewish military suppliers in Holland, who contributed to his successful invasion of England. However, to the dismay of the London Jews, William implemented policies that greatly worsened their condition. His Toleration Act of 1689 exempted “Their Majesties’ Protestant subjects, dissenting from the Church of England, from the penalties of certain laws,” but the Jews were not exempted.¹¹⁷ Even worse, the seventeenth clause of the Act expressly excluded from its benefits “any person that shall deny in his preaching or writing the doctrine of the blessed Trinity.” Thus, the royal protection of liberty of conscience—including that of the Jews—enacted by James II was now abandoned in the newly-titled “Glorious Revolution.”

As William prepared to invade Ireland, accompanied by his Dutch-Jewish military suppliers, his English Protestant partisans determined to impose an exorbitant tax on the Jewish community in London in order to finance the campaign. The Jews struggled to defend themselves, even vowing in November that they would “remove their effects into Holland” rather than pay the “imposition which Parliament has designed to lay upon them.” Their resistance to William’s war tax was remembered in anti-Jacobite propaganda in 1748, when Henry Fielding cited the tradition of the “Jacobite Rabbins” that the same angel which announced James II’s legitimate succession made “a second Appearance” in December 1688 and “convey’d away the

¹¹⁶ Ole Grell, “Introduction,” in *From Persecution*, 13.

¹¹⁷ D. Katz, *Jews in History*, 161–65.

King, together with his divine Commission, to another Country," where the Stuart's divine rights were preserved for his heirs.¹¹⁸

This "rabbinical" controversy provides a provocative context for a Masonic discussion, which took place in London on 6 October 1689, between a Scottish Presbyterian minister, Robert Kirk, and a Williamite Anglican bishop, Dr. Edward Stillingfleet. As a student of Gaelic and Scottish folklore, Kirk had gathered much rare and secret information about Scottish traditions. At the London dinner, Stillingfleet quizzed him about "the 2nd Sight, only heard of in the highlands of Scotland."¹¹⁹ When Stillingfleet expressed skepticism about the reality or permissibility of second sight, Kirk affirmed its reality but suggested that it might "be an extended form of natural eyesight," like that of cats and lynxes at night or telescope-aided human sight. Despite Kirk's semi-scientific argument, Stillingfleet maintained that the devil was involved. Kirk then gave a partial explanation of the Mason Word, which moved the bishop to call it "a Rabbinical mystery."¹²⁰

Perhaps provoked by this discussion, Kirk visited the Bevis Marks Synagogue on 25 January 1690 in order to observe the ceremonies. He probably learned that the officiating rabbi, Solomon Allyon, came from Safed, "the centre of cabbalistic studies in Palestine and arguably in the entire Jewish world."¹²¹ Also present in London at this time was Solomon Jehudah Leon Templo, son of the Masonic Rabbi Leon. Unfortunately, we do not know if Kirk met Templo, but his subsequent writing makes the possibility relevant. After returning to Scotland, Kirk published the result of his Jewish-Masonic investigation in 1691:

The Mason-Word, which tho some make a Misterie of it, I will not conceal a little of what I know; its like a Rabbinical tradition in a way of comment on Jachin and Boaz the two pillars erected in Solomon's Temple; with an addition of som secret signe delivered from hand to hand, by which they know, and become familiar with another.¹²²

¹¹⁸ H. Fielding, *Jacobite's Journal*, 282–83.

¹¹⁹ See account in D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 132–33.

¹²⁰ Kirk had earlier told Aubrey that the pyramidal stones at Stonehenge derived from Hebrew idol worship; see R. Plot, *Oxfordshire*, 343.

¹²¹ D. Katz, *Jews in History*, 161–62.

¹²² Robert Kirk, *The Secret Commonwealth and A Short Treatise of Charms and Spells* (1691), ed. S. Sanderson (London, 1976), 88–89.

Stevenson notes that “The secret sign delivered from hand to hand is the first British reference to a masonic handshake.” More importantly—and relevant to Scottish Masonic attitudes towards the Jews—was the hint at Cabalistic associations for the Mason Word:

Kirk does not actually identify them [Jachin and Boaz] as words that were part of the Word—he merely says the Word was a comment on these words—but the masonic catechisms reveal that Boaz was the word given to the entered apprentice, Jachin that given to the fellow craft. When Kirk explained this to Stillingfleet the latter called it a “Rabbinical mystery”; as the words of the Mason Word were connected with Solomon’s Temple it was natural to connect their use with Jewish traditions, and Stillingfleet probably had in mind the Cabbala . . .¹²³

Though the influence of Rabbi Leon on Restoration Freemasonry disappeared from contemporary records in England, it may have been carried to Ireland by royalist Masons who appreciated his loyalty to the Stuart cause. Hühner notes that in the 1660’s, when Irish genealogists published the characteristics of different nationalities, they “strangely enough” represented the Jews “as being pre-eminent as builders.”¹²⁴ Given this popular Irish belief that “For building the noble Jews are found,” an interest in Leon’s architectural and heraldic designs would be natural for royalist Masons in Ireland. There is a hazy tradition that “ancient” Irish Masons secretly used Leon’s Masonic coat of arms in the 1680’s.¹²⁵ With Dutch Jews playing a prominent role as on-site suppliers to William’s army in Ireland, it would not be surprising if Leon’s pro-Stuart heraldry went underground with the suppression of the Jacobite rebellion.

Meanwhile in England, a new wave of propaganda emerged, aimed at converting the Jews. Bishop Stillingfleet and other Williamite churchmen talked excitedly of Protestant victories against the Papacy, which they linked with an outburst of millenaral prophecies about the imminent conversion of the Jews.¹²⁶ After William defeated the Jacobite armies at the Battle of the Boyne (July 1690), he returned to London in September determined to make the English Jews contribute financially to his military campaign, which now included war

¹²³ D. Stevenson, *Origins*, 133–34.

¹²⁴ Leon Hühner, “The Jews of Ireland: an Historical Sketch,” *TJHSE*, 5 (1902–05), 232. The characterisation was documented in *MacFirbis’s Book of Genealogies*, finished in 1666.

¹²⁵ A. Shane, “Leon,” 164–65.

¹²⁶ D. Katz, *Jews in History*, 161–62.

against France. Pressured by English merchants, the king in October levied customs duties on all English exports effected by foreign merchants, including Jews previously naturalised under the Stuarts. By December the negative effect on trade led Parliament to abolish the increased alien duties.

Though Katz initially defines William's actions as "a deliberate policy of near persecution," he later concludes that the king had no ideological reason for his attacks on the London Jews, whom he merely regarded "as a dormant financial asset which might be tapped in this, the Crown's hour of need."¹²⁷ Norman Roth goes further, however, and views the Williamites' attempt to prohibit Jews from trading in gold and silver as dangerously discriminatory:

... unlike the legal issues involving oaths, where the distinction was made between those who would swear an oath as Christians on the Christian Bible and those who would not, this is the first case of clear discrimination against the Jews simply for being Jews in a situation that applied without distinction to all subjects of the realm. In vain did the Jews point out in their petition, which ... was not even allowed a hearing (contrary to the procedure under Stuart kings when all Jewish petitions were at least considered), their contributions to trade and the economy ...

But William, as his Christian subjects were also to discover to their bitter disappointment was in many ways a medieval tyrant of a ruler. Here again was the familiar discriminatory legislation, the extortion of money from the Jewish community, the talk of "privileges" and "obligations" so characteristic of medieval Jewish relations with the sovereign.¹²⁸

By judicious bribery, the London Jews were able to alleviate some of these attacks, but it is small wonder that many of them remained privately sympathetic to the Jacobite cause. Moreover, as discontent with the Williamite settlement simmered in Scotland, anti-Jacobite propaganda increasingly characterized the Scots as Jews. In 1691, when a reader inquired of the popular *Athenian Mercury*, "Why do Scotch-men hate swines flesh?" the London editor replied that it was a borrowing from the Jews.¹²⁹ In September, when the Williamite dean of guild in Edinburgh tried to deny trading privileges to David Brown, "a profest Jew," the old treasurer Hugh Blair successfully

¹²⁷ Ibid., 173; D. Katz, "Jews ... and 1688," 242.

¹²⁸ N. Roth, "Social and Intellectual Currents," 189–90.

¹²⁹ A. Williamson, "A Pil," 249, 257n.34.

argued for Brown's legal rights and for the historical importance of the Jews to Scottish Protestantism. Levy notes that this decision "may be regarded as a Charter of Liberty for the Jews of Seventeenth Century Edinburgh."¹³⁰

Thus, the odd historical phenomenon of the Jacobite Jews, who influenced the international development of *Écossais* Freemasonry in the next century, was rooted in the fall-out of the "Glorious Revolution." In 1748, when Fielding mocked the infernal trio of Jacobites, Jews, and Masons, he looked back to Jewish support of James II and lamented the Jews' continuing identification with the Stuart cause. According to the "Jacobite Rabbins," when James died in exile, the angel appeared again and "seized of the same Commission, which descended, in an Invisible manner, to his Heirs, who from time to time, one time or another, are to be restored to the full Exercise of the same indefeasible, divine, lawful, and lawless Authority." Foreshadowing later claims of Jewish-Masonic conspiracy, Fielding then asserted the shared revolutionary yearnings of Jews and Jacobites:

... it is the unhappy Fate of both these People, who have been alike deprived of their own divinely constituted Kings, to live under Governments which they hold to be damnable and diabolical, and no Allegiance nor Submission to be due to them: But, on the contrary, are daily hoping and looking for their destruction.¹³¹

In this propaganda piece, subsidized by the Whig-Hanoverian ministry, Fielding added an unsavory chapter to the saga of the Judeo-Scots, who allegedly circumcised themselves after the battle of Culloden: "there is not a *Jacobite* now in England who is uncircumcised." He also provided an early example of anti-Semitic, anti-Masonic charges that would culminate in the infamous forgery, *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*.

The fate of Stuart Freemasonry during the early Williamite regime is difficult to piece together, because of destruction of documents and increasing secrecy maintained by Jacobite resisters and exiles. Anderson noted that "many of the Fraternity's records" from Charles II's reign were lost during James II's reign and "at the Revolution."¹³²

¹³⁰ A. Levy, "Origins of Scottish Jewry," 136.

¹³¹ H. Fielding, *Jacobite's Journal*, 283.

¹³² J. Anderson, *Constitutions (1738)*, 105-06.

Robert Mylne and James Smith acquiesced to the new regime and continued to gain official employment, especially on military projects. Mylne supervised the repairs to Edinburgh Castle after the government siege of 1689, and he may have advised General Mackay on plans to build Fort William in 1690. This revival of the Cromwellian policy of forts of occupation would soon arouse patriotic opposition. Mylne's former colleague William Bruce withdrew from official work and concentrated on domestic buildings for various Jacobite nobles. He occasionally provided architectural advice to the Duke of Hamilton, whose family would participate in Freemasonry while wavering in their political loyalties over the next decades.¹³³

William Bruce continued to secretly work for James's cause, and he was indirectly instrumental in the Jacobite outreach to Sweden—where many Scots fled after William's victories. Despite government surveillance, Bruce and his Jacobite-Masonic allies sought contacts with sympathizers in northern England, such as the steel-manufacturer Ambrose Crowley, who maintained important trade with Sweden and Scotland. Around 1688–90 Crowley established a masonic lodge at Sunderland, close to Newcastle, which served the operative masons involved in constructing the large stone buildings for the steel works.¹³⁴ The lodge probably also served as a means of bonding his religiously and ethnically diverse workforce. As a Quaker, Crowley was grateful to James II for his policy of religious toleration and for the royal protection given to the steel-maker's foreign workmen, who included Catholics and Lutherans.¹³⁵ Several Quakers had joined lodges in Scotland during James's residence in the north and, following their leader William Penn, they retained their sympathy for the Jacobite cause. Like Crowley's employees, they agreed with James that "liberty of conscience" would benefit industry and trade.

Crowley provides an early preview of Jacobite-Masonic links between Edinburgh, Newcastle, and Gothenburg that would endure for the next seven decades. By 1691 Sir James Montgomerie, radical Covenanter turned Jacobite plotter, gained Swedish support for James

¹³³ D. Stevenson, *First Freemasons*, 83–89. Charles Hamilton, natural son of the Fourth Duke of Hamilton, joined the Jacobite lodge in Paris in 1726; see E. Corp, *Burlington*, 20.

¹³⁴ Leo Gooch, *The Desperate Faction? The Jacobites of North-East England* (Hull: Hull UP, 1995), 202n.14; also 39, 111.

¹³⁵ M.W. Flinn, *Men of Iron: The Crowleys in the Early Iron Industry* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1962), 16, 39–40.

II's cause, and two years later the Swedish ambassador in London would hide Jacobite agents.¹³⁶ As noted earlier, the Swedish king Carl XI allowed a Scottish-affiliated lodge to continue meeting in Gothenburg. His son Carl XII would become a staunch supporter of James II's son, the "Old Pretender," and allegedly a protector of *Écossais* Freemasonry in Sweden.¹³⁷ The Tessin family would provide important support for Jacobite exiles and Masons in Sweden and on the Continent. By 1788 the Swedish king Gustaf III would inherit the Grand Mastership of the Masonic Knights Templar directly from James II's grandson, the "Young Pretender," Charles Edward Stuart.¹³⁸

In the meantime in England, William III was preoccupied with European war plans and paid little attention to architecture in his new kingdom. After a hiatus in 1689, Wren managed to resume his position as Surveyor of Works, and he attempted to complete his rebuilding projects. However, as Summerson notes, during the next decade—"this vacant interval"—few churches were built in England.¹³⁹ French and Continental historians argue that Wren maintained his private Jacobite sympathies, while he worked discretely and cautiously under the new regime.¹⁴⁰ Jeffery suggests that the lack of written documents about Wren's work during these years was deliberate:

... his tracks are usually well-hidden. His early brushes with authority had taught him to be wary of committing himself to paper and of exposing his ideas to public criticism and debate ... he may just have carried on, unwilling to record decisions on paper.¹⁴¹

Wren still maintained contact with Freemasons in Scotland, and the Hamiltons often consulted him and Bruce about the progress of their grandiose palace.¹⁴²

¹³⁶ P.A. Hopkins, "Sir James Montgomerie of Skelmorlie," in E. Corp, *Stuart Court*, 51–56; Mark Goldie, "The Roots of True Whiggism," *History of Political Thought*, 1 (1980), 228–29.

¹³⁷ See my "Swedenborg, Jacobitism, and Freemasonry," in Erland Brock, ed., *Swedenborg and His Influence* (Bryn Athyn: Academy of the New Church, 1988), 359–79.

¹³⁸ Claude Nordmann, *Gustave III: un démocrate couronné* (Lille: Presses Universitaires, 1986), 214–20; Frank McLynn, *Charles Edward Stuart* (1988; Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991), 532–36.

¹³⁹ J. Summerson, *Architecture in Britain, 1530–1830* (London: Pelican, 1935), 184.

¹⁴⁰ G. Bord, *Franc-Maçonnerie*, 55–57; Margaret Jacob, *Living the Enlightenment: Freemasonry and Politics in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991), 92.

¹⁴¹ Paul Jeffery, *The City Churches of Christopher Wren* (London: Hambledon, 1996), 28–29.

¹⁴² J. Macaulay, "Seventeenth-century Genesis," 18–19.

Wren soon realized that William III deliberately avoided the monumental stone construction beloved by his Stuart predecessors. However, when Queen Mary—James's daughter—requested a rebuilding of Hampton Court Palace, Wren began a set of ambitious designs. Then, in summer 1689 William appointed a triumvirate of his supporters—William Talman, George London, and William Bentinck Earl of Portland (his Dutch favorite)—to oversee the building work. Their collaboration “was close and often inimical to Wren's own plans.”¹⁴³ Talman especially tried to undermine Wren, even accusing him of causing the deaths of workmen in a collapsed building at Hampton Court. “A man of colic and irritability,” the autocratic Talman developed “a peculiarly intimate relationship with the king.”¹⁴⁴ Covetous of Wren's position, he hoped to replace him. In later years, Talman became the confidential friend of John Theophilus Desaguliers, who with James Anderson developed the “modern” English system of anti-Jacobite Freemasonry in 1717–23.¹⁴⁵

In December, when William and Mary moved into Kensington Palace, extensive renovations were required, but Wren was not allowed to carry out the expensive stonework that he favored. Harris explains that Williamite “court architecture was brick ornamented with stone,” because “stone architecture required the expensive talents of sculptors to make it effective.”¹⁴⁶ He then laments that “the best of baroque architecture is built in stone, not brick.” This royal neglect of the highest-quality masonic skills and designs, which frustrated Wren, sheds some light on a note made by Aubrey on 18 May 1691, which has long provoked controversy among Masonic historians:

MDM, this day . . . is a great convention at St. Paul's-church of the Fraternity of the Accepted [“Free” being struck out]—Masons where Sr. Christopher Wren is to be adopted a Brother; and Sr. Henry Goodric . . . of ye Tower, & divers [“sev'al” being struck out] others—there have been Kings, that have been of this—Sodalitie.¹⁴⁷

Aubrey added this “Memorandum” to his MS. “Natural History of Wiltshire,” which was then being transcribed for the archives of the

¹⁴³ John Harris, “The Architecture of the Williamite Court,” in R.P. Maccubbin and M. Hamilton-Phillips, eds., *The Age of William III and Mary II: Power, Politics, and Patronage, 1688–1702* (Williamsburg: College of William and Mary, 1989), 227.

¹⁴⁴ H. Colvin, *Biog. Dict.*, 949; J. Harris, *Talman*, 20, 32.

¹⁴⁵ “John Talman,” *Walpole Society*, 59 (1997), 253.

¹⁴⁶ J. Harris, “Architecture,” 231.

¹⁴⁷ M. Bagent and B. Williamson, “Wren,” 188–89.

Royal Society. B.G. Cramer, clerk to the society, copied the note with one possibly significant change—i.e., writing “Adopted” instead of Aubrey’s “Accepted” Masons. Evelyn also recorded the ceremony of 18 May, noting that “Sr Christopher Wren (Architect of St Pauls) was at a Convention . . . of Free-masons, adopted a brother of that Society, shone have Kings ben of this sodality.”¹⁴⁸ Evelyn followed this with his note about Dugdale’s information on the medieval masons.

By participating in this unusual public ceremony, did the privately Jacobite Wren hope to allay suspicion that he maintained an inner circle of “Accepted” Masons, who had worked with him on earlier Stuart projects? Perhaps Wren hoped to give “Acception” a more public and thus politically acceptable status. Aubrey first wrote “Free” and then inserted “Accepted” in his personal manuscript, while Cramer wrote “Adopted” in his more public transcript. Wren’s companion in adoption, Sir Henry Goodricke, had secured the city of York for William at the Revolution and was subsequently rewarded with the positions of Lieutenant-General of the Ordinance and Privy Councillor. Thus, he would certainly lend political respectability to Wren and his workers.

Goodricke was also interested in architecture and operative masonry, for he had supervised the demolishing and rebuilding of the ancient stone edifice at Ribston (“Tympill Ribstayne”), originally constructed by the Knights Templar and later sold to Goodricke’s ancestors by the Knights Hospitallers.¹⁴⁹ He was currently planning to rebuild the ruined Templar chapel on his estate in York. Goodricke had shared these architectural interests with Sir John Reresby, a neighbor who employed many York masons in extensive building projects. A strong royalist, Reresby had possibly been introduced to Freemasonry by Moray while both were in exile, or by Buckingham during the duke’s residence in York. Heisler suggests that Reresby became a Masonic “sworn brother” with Goodricke, who had shared his royalist sentiments until William’s actual arrival in England.¹⁵⁰ Thus, Goodricke’s interest in chivalric architecture and Freemasonry, as well as his earlier Stuart loyalties, perhaps provided common ground with Wren.

¹⁴⁸ British Library: Evelyn MS.173.f.9; in R. Heisler, “Evelyn,” 263.

¹⁴⁹ Charles A. Goodricke, *Ribston . . . Seat of the Goodricke Family*. (London, 1902), 69–79.

¹⁵⁰ Andrew Browning, ed., *Memoirs of Sir John Reresby* (Glasgow: Jackson, 1936), 13, 30, 57, 72–78, 137; R. Heisler, “Evelyn,” 262.

In 1691 Goodricke enjoyed enormous powers of patronage and rewarded court supporters with jobs, money, and favors.¹⁵¹ The Freemasons who performed the public ceremony probably hoped to gain aristocratic and popular support for Wren's ambitious agenda and for their craft. Disappointingly, over the next years, the use of stone for building material would be largely superseded by brick: "This resulted in a decline in the Mason trade" in England, while "stone remained the main building material" in Scotland.¹⁵² In his pro-Williamite history of Freemasonry, Anderson admitted the decline of the craft under the Dutch king—"Particular lodges were not so frequent and mostly occasional in the South."¹⁵³ However, he also tried—almost comically—to present William as a "brother," claiming that the new king was "privately made a Free Mason, approved of their Choice of G. Master Wren, and encourag'd him." When Anderson published that implausible statement in 1738, Wren had long been dead and could not contradict him. William's contemporaries Aubrey and Evelyn both implied in 1691 that the affiliation of kings with Masonry was a thing of the past.

Among the royalist supporters of Stuart Masonic policy who found themselves adrift after James II's flight was John Dryden, who lost his laureateship to his hated rival Shadwell. Despite tempting offers of official patronage, Dryden refused to re-convert from Catholicism, but he did promise "acquiescence under the present government, & a forebearing satire upon it."¹⁵⁴ Nevertheless, Dryden secretly stayed in touch with the exiled court, while he sought new literary forms to simultaneously express and disguise his Jacobite sympathies. In 1690 Dryden was in contact with Richard Maitland, Lauderdale's nephew, who had fought for James at the Battle of the Boyne and then found refuge at St. Germain. Maitland worked on a Jacobite-themed translation of Virgil's *Aeneid*, which he planned to dedicate to James's queen, Mary of Modena. He noted that he began the translation in England in 1689, "when I durst not appear for ye Usurpers," and he desired that it will "be useful one day" to "ye prince of our rising hope." However, Maitland subsequently fell out

¹⁵¹ E. Cruickshanks, *Glorious Revolution*, 62.

¹⁵² George Draffen, "Freemasonry in Scotland in 1717," *AQC*, 83 (1979), 366.

¹⁵³ J. Anderson, *Constitutions (1738)*, 106–07.

¹⁵⁴ Howard Erskine-Hill, *Poetry and the Realm of Politics: Shakespeare to Dryden* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 186.

of favor at St. Germain, because of his Protestant objections to the extreme Catholic policy of Melfort's party. He then sent his translation to Dryden, who gratefully utilized it but toned down its explicit Jacobite analogies.

It was perhaps no coincidence that Jonathan Swift would later quote Dryden's lines about bees in the *Aeneid* translation, when he revealed that "a Bee has in all Ages and Nations been the Grand *Hieroglyphick* of *Masonry*."¹⁵⁵ Moreover, the Dryden quotation occurred in the midst of Swift's claims about the Scottish origins and subsequent French affiliations of Freemasonry. According to a later Masonic historian, "The Stuart dynasty adopted the Masonic emblem of the Beehive, as the symbol of resurrection," but "our English brethren dropped the emblem because of its Stuart connection."¹⁵⁶ While Dryden worked with Maitland's translation, he was aware that the exiled Scot shared the architectural and Masonic interests of Lauderdale, the Bruces, and the Mylnes—interests which Dryden still identified with Stuart legitimacy and ideals.¹⁵⁷

Thus, in November 1693, when Dryden wrote "To my Dear Friend Mr. Congreve, on his Comedy, call'd *The Double Dealer*," he took advantage of the safe occasion of praising a Williamite poet whom he admired to revive his Stuart-architectural imagery. Describing the Irish-schooled Congreve as the worthy heir of Charles II's court of warriors and wits, where the rough soil of "Our Age" was finally cultivated, he subtly qualified his praise of this new "Vitruvian" poet:

... what we gain'd in skill we lost in strength.
 Our Builders were, with want of Genius, curst;
 The Second Temple was not like the first:
 Till You, the best *Vitruvius*, come at length;
 Our Beauties equal; but excel our strength.
 Firm *Dorique* Pillars found your solid Base:
 The Fair *Corinthian* Crowns the higher Space;
 Thus all below is Strength, and all above is Grace.¹⁵⁸

While Dryden used the architectural imagery for literary praise, his allusion to the second Jewish Temple—inferior to Solomon's and

¹⁵⁵ J. Swift, *Prose Works*, V, 327–28.

¹⁵⁶ Ray Denslow, *Masonic Rites and Degrees*. Transactions of Missouri Lodge of Research, 12 (1955), 235. The emblem is still used by Scottish Rite Masons in America.

¹⁵⁷ On the Maitland family, see M. Glendinning, *History*, 83.

¹⁵⁸ J. Dryden, *Works*, IV, 432.

built after the Babylonian exile—implied return and restoration, though in circumscribed conditions.

Swift initially supported the “Glorious Revolution,” but he would later lament the deterioration of Stuart-style architecture under the Williamite regime:

On earth, the god of wealth was made
Sole patron of the building trade,
Leaving the wits the spacious air,
With license to build castles there.¹⁵⁹

In his satiric lines Swift touched upon a “persistent characteristic” in English culture that Summerson identified as “a national philosophy which expressed itself . . . in a horrified contempt for architects and architecture.”¹⁶⁰ When the Stuarts were driven from the British throne, emblematic and microcosmic architecture lost its most important royal patrons.

During the sad final years of James VII and II, who died in 1701, Stuart Freemasonry went largely underground in England, making its history almost impossible to trace—though shadowy claims were made throughout the next centuries. According to Anderson, in 1695 Charles Lennox, First Duke of Richmond, master of a lodge at Chichester, “was chosen Grand Master, and approv’d by the King [William III].”¹⁶¹ However, Bord notes that Richmond was a natural son of Charles II and his French mistress Louise de Kérouailles, that he replaced Wren as Grand Master, and that he maintained the Jacobite affiliations.¹⁶² Wren allegedly resumed the office in 1698 when, according to Russian tradition, he initiated Peter I of Russia during the Czar’s visit to London.¹⁶³ A Swedish Rite Mason affirmed that Wren served again from 1710 to 1716.¹⁶⁴

¹⁵⁹ J. Swift, “Vanbrugh’s House” (1703); in *Poems*, 581–83.

¹⁶⁰ Summerson is quoted by Colin St. John Wilson in “The British Library,” letter to *Times Literary Supplement* (23 October 1998), 19.

¹⁶¹ J. Anderson, *Constitutions* (1738), 107.

¹⁶² G. Bord, *Franc-Maçonnerie*, 57; also, K. Mackenzie, *Royal Masonic*, 286.

¹⁶³ Tatiana Bakounine, *Le Répertoire Biographique des Francs-Maçons Russes* (Bruxelles: Editions Petropolis, 1940), 404.

¹⁶⁴ Margaret Jacob, *Living the Enlightenment: Freemasonry and Politics in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (New York: Oxford UP, 1991), 92. Claim made in letter from Vignoles to Zinnendorf in 1772 (not 1774); they were initiates of *Écossais* and Swedish Rite systems.

In the meantime, the exiled Jacobite “knights” carried their chivalric and fraternal traditions into far-flung corners of Europe. But, it was in France especially where they revived the Masonic strategies and theosophies that sustained Moray, Balcarres, and Kincardine during the Interregnum. In July 1690, when a defeated James II sailed from Ireland to France in the *Lauzun*, the ship was commanded by James Walsh, whose name-sake regiment carried its lodge and rituals to France. The Walsh family would prosper as privateers and ship-builders in France, and they continued to participate in Jacobite Masonry through the difficult years ahead. James Walsh’s grandson Antoine Vincent would accompany James II’s grandson, “Bonnie Prince Charlie,” to Scotland for the Jacobite Rising of 1745.¹⁶⁵

Early in 1691 Balcarres escaped to St. Germain, where he drafted his *Memoirs Touching the Revolution in Scotland*, at the request of James II. As heir of the “Rosicrucian Earl” and protégé of his guardian Moray, Balcarres brought with him long traditions of Scottish mystical Masonry. He also continued his mentors’ commitment to religious toleration, a policy maintained by James at St. Germain. Cruickshanks notes that despite pressure from Louis XIV, “the exiled king never gave way, insisting that his subjects be allowed to worship according to the dictates of their conscience.”¹⁶⁶ Nevertheless, Whig propagandists portrayed James as “a servile crony” of the anti-Huguenot French monarch and the Stuart court as a bastion of autocratic Popery. Despite their message, the perceived linkage between toleration and Jacobitism became so widespread that one Williamite defended himself from charges of crypto-Jacobitism by publishing a diatribe against “liberty of conscience.”¹⁶⁷

While still in Scotland, Balcarres and his allies resolved, “not withstanding all our scruples,” to collaborate with “The Club” organized by Andrew Fletcher of Saltoun, a radical Covenanter and supporter of the Revolution, who increasingly resented William’s encroachments on Scottish national prerogatives.¹⁶⁸ Though Balcarres did not agree with Fletcher’s anti-monarchical sentiments, he respected him as a Scottish patriot. Fletcher’s father had known Moray, Kincardine,

¹⁶⁵ J. Tuckett, “Walsh,” 191–95.

¹⁶⁶ E. Cruickshanks, *By Force or Default*, 5, 40.

¹⁶⁷ Edmund Bohun, *Three Charges Delivered at the General Quarter Sessions Holden at Ipswich* (London: Robert Clavell, 1693), A2, 22–23.

¹⁶⁸ Balcarres, *Memoirs*, 58.

and Burnet, and the son revived the use of the Masonic-style networks used in the early Covenanting movement to mount nationalist resistance first to James II and then to William III.¹⁶⁹ It was probably Balcarres's work with Fletcher that provoked the suspicion of Melfort, who returned from his diplomatic mission to the Pope in 1691 and attempted to undermine James's policy of toleration. Appointed secretary of state, Melfort was made a Knight of the Garter in April 1692—thus adding an English honor to his Scottish one as Knight of the Thistle. However, Melfort now advocated an aggressive military policy which alienated many moderate Jacobites. According to Balcarres, Melfort and the priests "artfully forged a calumny against him, and he was forbid the court."¹⁷⁰

By the time Balcarres regained James's favor, the cautious Charles Middleton, Second Earl of Middleton, had replaced the hard-line Melfort as secretary of state. Middleton was the son of the First Earl, who had earlier collaborated with Moray's Masonic network and who acted as liaison between Charles II and the Jews. The Second Earl had served under his father at Tangier, and he remained committed to liberty of conscience.¹⁷¹ His sons became Catholic Jacobites but insisted on a policy of toleration if the Stuarts were restored. John, Third Earl of Middleton, would join the Jacobite lodge in Paris in 1726.¹⁷²

With the moderates now in control, Melfort was forced to move to Angers before settling in Paris, where he rebuilt his great art collection and continued his studies in architecture. He corresponded with his sister, whose husband John Hay, Twelfth Earl of Erroll, was a leader in the Jacobite lodge at Aberdeen.¹⁷³ Melfort often sent her paintings, perhaps as a cover for political information. In 1705, when Melfort regained favor at St. Germain, a Masonic song circulated in Paris that boasted of the secrecy, loyalty, and expertise of the Freemasons. Entitled "Les Freimaçons/Vau de Ville sur un air anglois," the manuscript song was confiscated among other forbid-

¹⁶⁹ "Andrew Fletcher," *DNB*; Robert Watson, M.D., *The Political Works of Fletcher of Salton* (London: H.D. Symonds, 1798), 39.

¹⁷⁰ A. Lindsay, *Lives of Lindsays*, 178–79.

¹⁷¹ G. Jones, *Middleton*, 17; Charles Middleton, Second Earl of Middleton, *DNB*.

¹⁷² E. Corp, *Burlington*, 20.

¹⁷³ D. Stevenson, *First Freemasons*, 128–30, 145.

den literature by the police.¹⁷⁴ Corp argues that Melfort developed contacts “with Freemasons (secret Jacobites) in England.”¹⁷⁵

In 1694–95 Melfort’s brother Perth also corresponded with their sister, who probably passed the letters on to her husband and fellow-initiates in the Aberdeen lodge.¹⁷⁶ Perth recounted his own architectural studies in France and Italy, describing various traditions and techniques of operative masons and expressing a Masonic-style appreciation of the internationalism and fraternalism within “the universal reach of the Catholic Church,” which included millions of members from Scotland, Ireland, Greece, Syria, India, and Africa. The linkage of chivalric and Masonic interests by Perth’s descendants becomes provocative, for in 1705 his son was made a Knight of the Thistle by James “III”; in 1726 his thirteen year-old grandson was initiated in the Jacobite lodge at Paris and, as an adult in 1745, allegedly participated in the ceremony at Holyrood Palace when Prince Charles Edward Stuart was made Grand Master of the Masonic Order of Templars.¹⁷⁷

Though the First Duke of Perth remained true to his Catholic conversion, he was more broad-minded in religious matters than his brother. He welcomed Balcarres, an Episcopalian, back to court and praised him for rising above the internecine quarrels at St. Germain. Sharing Balcarres’s faith in James’s declarations of religious liberty, Perth was not bothered by Balcarres’s friendship with the free-thinkers Jean Le Clerc and Pierre Bayle. Balcarres evidently convinced the latter of James’s sincerity for, as Goldie points out, Bayle’s writings “reveal an enthusiasm for James II’s toleration of Dissenters, and he was to be no unambiguous admirer of the Glorious Revolution.”¹⁷⁸ Like Swift’s Scottish-Masonic friend, the second-sighted physician John Arbuthnot, Balcarres saw no contradiction in being a Jacobite

¹⁷⁴ Alain Mothu and Charles Porset, “A Propos du Secret des Francs-Maçons: une Référence Jacobite (1705)?,” in Charles Porset, ed., *Studia Latomorum & Historica: Mélanges offerts à Daniel Ligou* (Paris: Editions Slatkine, 1998), 327–33. I am grateful to Robert Cooper, librarian of Grand Lodge of Scotland, for this reference.

¹⁷⁵ E. Corp, “Melfort,” 46; J. Clark, “Lord Burlington,” 252.

¹⁷⁶ William Jerdan, ed., *Letters from James, Earl of Perth, Lord Chancellor of Scotland, to his Sister, the Countess of Erroll*. Camden Society, vol. 33 (London, 1845), 26, 32–34, 61, 81.

¹⁷⁷ See E. Corp, *Burlington*, 11, 13, 20; J.E.S. Tuckett, “Dr. Begemann and the Alleged Templar Chapter at Edinburgh in 1745,” *AQC*, 33 (1920), 40–62.

¹⁷⁸ Mark Goldie, “Religious Intolerance in Restoration England,” in O. Grell, *From Persecution*, 340.

and a republican.¹⁷⁹ It was a paradoxical mentality later expressed by the great Scottish poet and Freemason, Robert Burns, during the revolutionary 1790's.

After the Williamite repressions of December 1691, the exiled Scots were joined by thousands of Irish refugees, who fled to France, Italy, and Spain. These "Wild Geese" included nobles and soldiers who carried their "Celtic" Masonic traditions into the armies of friendly Catholic sovereigns, who still maintained chivalric orders of military and religious knights.¹⁸⁰ The Irish Masonic historian Lepper observes that the army "was a great disseminator of the true light," for "our militant forefathers" found that "the secrets of a mason were very useful pieces of equipment to carry with them to a campaign."¹⁸¹ He further argues that "masonic degrees were in full vogue long prior to the creation of the [modern English] Grand Lodge in 1717" and that "the lodges of St. John maintained their association with the operative lodges." He implies that the Jacobite lodges developed degrees beyond the basic operative ones.

The many French, German, Italian, Swedish, and Russian publications, issued from the eighteenth through twentieth centuries, which reveal oral traditions about the export of Jacobite Masonry to the Continent will be discussed in my projected books on eighteenth-century, high-degree Freemasonry. However, it is worth mentioning now the version of that history learned by a Scottish Mason, Professor John Robison, in the 1770's, when he participated in lodges established by Jacobite exiles and their supporters in France, Belgium, Germany, and Russia. Robison lamented "the heap of rubbish with which Anderson disgraced his *Constitutions of Free Masonry*," which had unfortunately become "the basis of masonic history."¹⁸² Recounting the different historical instruction he received in *Écossais* lodges, Robison asserted:

¹⁷⁹ George Aitken, *The Life and Works of John Arbuthnot* (1898; rpt. New York: Russell, 1968), 164.

¹⁸⁰ Charles Trench, *Grace's Card: Irish Catholic Landlords, 1690-1800* (Dublin: Mercier, 1997), 34; S. Murphy, "Irish Jacobitism," 74-82.

¹⁸¹ John Heron Lepper, *The Differences Between English and Irish Masonic Rituals Treated Historically* (Dublin: George Healy, 1920), 17, 23, 39.

¹⁸² John Robison, *Proofs of a Conspiracy Against All the Religions and Governments of Europe, Carried on in the Secret Meetings of Freemasons, Illuminati, and Reading Societies*, 3rd ed. (Philadelphia: T. Dobson, 1798), 17. Though most historians scoff at Robison's sweeping charges of radical Masonic conspiracy in the 1790's, they have not examined his accounts of his personal experiences in *Écossais* lodges in the 1770's. The

We also know that Charles II. was made a Mason, and frequented the Lodges . . . His brother and successor James II. was of a more serious and manly cast of mind, and had little pleasure in the frivolous ceremonies of Masonry. He did not frequent the Lodges.¹⁸³

Rather than repeating Anderson's claim that James was *not* a "Brother Mason," Robison implied that he did not attend often or enjoy lodge meetings. Moreover, Robison added that the lodges had become the rendezvous of "accepted" Masons who had no association with actual building projects—which suggests that James "did not frequent" English lodges. In Scotland and Ireland, the lodges continued to be closely associated with practical architecture. After the Williamite revolution, James and "his most zealous adherents" took refuge in France:

. . . they took Free Masonry with them to the continent, where it was immediately received by the French, and was cultivated with great zeal in a manner suited to the taste and habits of that highly cultivated people. The Lodges in France naturally became the rendezvous of the adherents to their banished King, and the means of a carrying on a correspondence with their friends in England.¹⁸⁴

From France the exiles scattered across Europe and established clandestine Masonic networks. Robison notes that "All the Brethren on the Continent agree in saying, that Freemasonry was imported from Great Britain about the beginning of this century [ca. 1690–1700] and this in the form of a mystical society."¹⁸⁵

Robison then described a special chivalric degree created by the Jacobites:

It was in the Lodges held at St. Germain's that the degree of *Chevalier Maçon Ecossois* was added to the three SYMBOLICAL degrees of English Masonry . . . this rank of Scotch Knight was called the *first* degree of the *Maçon Parfait*. There is a device belonging to this Lodge which deserves notice. A lion, wounded by an arrow, and escaped from the stake to which he had been bound, with the broken rope still about his neck, is represented lying at the mouth of a cave, and occupied with mathematical instruments which are lying near him. A broken

latter material is important for its rare insight into the Scottish-Jacobite traditions that were preserved in various European Masonic rites. Moreover, Robison's descriptions are corroborated by the Continental Masonic documents published in Charles Porset, *Les Philalèthes et les Convents de Paris* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1998).

¹⁸³ J. Robison, *Proofs*, 23.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 27.

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 541.

crown lies at the foot of the stake. There can be little doubt but that this emblem alludes to the dethronement, the captivity, the escape and asylum of James II. and his hopes of re-establishment by the help of the loyal Brethren. This emblem is worn as the gorget of the Scotch Knight. It is not very certain, however, when this degree was added, whether immediately after King James's Abdication, or about the time of the attempt to set his son on the British Throne. But it is certain, that in 1716, this and still higher degrees of Masonry were much in vogue in the court of France.¹⁸⁶

These claims of chivalric developments within Jacobite Masonry continue to provoke arguments among historians, because of the dearth of contemporary documentation until the 1720's. However, an oblique reinforcement comes from Swift, who drew upon his experiences in Dublin in 1688 and Ulster in 1695 to later describe the chivalric (as well as Cabalistic, Lullist, and Rosicrucian) associations of Scots-Irish Freemasonry. Swift's comical summary of "Celtic" traditions in "a Lodge of Free-Masons at O----h in U----r" (Omagh in Ulster) throws a retrospective light on developments in the fraternity in the 1690's.¹⁸⁷

In 1689 Swift fled the political turmoil in Dublin and moved to England, where he became amanuensis to the retired diplomat Sir William Temple at Moor Park. Temple shared Swift's sceptical curiosity about Rosicrucianism, which he had encountered in its radical form in Ireland during the 1650's.¹⁸⁸ He also dealt with operative masons there, who drew on Scots-Irish traditions. After the Restoration, Temple was employed on delicate secret missions by Charles II and Lord Arlington, both Masons, and he was kept abreast of Scottish affairs while serving at The Hague. In 1668 Arlington sent Temple a paper written by Moray and praised the Scot's expertise in chemistry.¹⁸⁹ Two years later Temple met Moray, who sought his assistance for the export to Holland of Kincardine's building stone, an enterprise which involved William Bruce and William Davidson.¹⁹⁰ Thus, when Temple discussed with Swift the secret diplomacy of Charles II, he may have revealed the role of Freemasonry in Stuart politics.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid., 28.

¹⁸⁷ J. Swift, *Prose*, V, 324.

¹⁸⁸ William Temple, *Five Miscellaneous Essays*, ed. Samuel Holt (Ann Arbor: Michigan UP, 1963), 200-01; "Sir William Temple," *DNB*.

¹⁸⁹ Arlington, *Letters*, 450.

¹⁹⁰ H. Paton, "Letters from . . . Lauderdale," 173, 181, 190, 234-35.

Swift was disappointed that Temple could not secure him a clerical position in England, and in 1695 he grudgingly agreed to take over the Anglican ministry at Kilroot in northern Ireland. The post had been held for decades by the Scottish immigrant Robert Mylne, kinsman of the famous Scottish Masonic family who had sent builders to Ulster since the 1620's.¹⁹¹ When Mylne's supporters contested Swift's appointment, the new minister had to work hard to develop good relationships with his parishioners. Hinting at his participation in lodge meetings at Omagh, Swift's mouthpiece the "Guardian" claimed that the brothers "press'd him hard to come into their Society, and at length prevailed." In the lodge, he evidently learned about Scottish traditions that were brought to Ulster by William St. Clair and other masons early in the century.

During Swift's frequent visits to St. Nicholas' Church in Carrickfergus, he would have seen the engraved tablet in praise of the restoration of the edifice: "This worke was begune in 1614 . . . and wrought by Thomas Paps free-mason . . . *Vvat Rex Jacobus*." Crossle argues that Swift had this tablet in mind when he composed his *Letter from the Grand Mistress of the Female Free-Masons*.¹⁹² It is thus relevant that Swift credited James VI of Scotland, "Grand-Master," with reviving Freemasonry in England when he acceded to the British throne.¹⁹³ Also displayed in the church was a Mason's ceremonial chair, which featured elaborate Masonic carvings (including a harp with square and compasses), the mysterious initials A.J.R.K.C.B., and date 1685.¹⁹⁴ The chair was an Irish version of a Scottish chair from Berwick-on-Tweed, a Masonic location that Swift (or his co-authors) mentioned earlier in the *Trinity Tripos*. Moreover, he would joke about similarly coded lines of initials in his Masonic burlesque—"I C.U.B.YY for me. *I see you be too wise for me*."

In the *Letter from the Grand Mistress*, published anonymously in 1724, Swift revealed an "ancient" Scots-Irish system of Masonry that

¹⁹¹ On Swift in Ulster, see Louis Landa, *Swift and the Church of Ireland* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1954), 12–21; Irvin Ehrenpreis, *Swift: the Man, His Works, and the Age* (London: Methuen, 1962), 159–66, 186. Both authors were unaware of the Masonic reputation of the Mylne family. For Thomas Mylne as a masonic builder ca. 1622, see James Curl, *The Londonderry Plantation, 1609–1914* (Chichester: Phillimore, 1986), 309.

¹⁹² Phillip Crossle, "Freemasonry in Ireland, circa 1725–31," *The Lodge of Research*, No. CC. Ireland. *Transactions for the Year 1724* (Dublin: G.F. Healey, 1931), 94.

¹⁹³ J. Swift, *Prose*, V, 326.

¹⁹⁴ J. Lepper and P. Crossle, *History*, I, 33, 38.

contrasted dramatically with the “modern” English system extolled by Anderson’s *Constitutions* in 1723. Moreover, at this time, Swift was perceived by the Whig government as a Jacobite sympathizer. Though part of this passage was quoted earlier, it will be useful to now place it in the Scots-Irish context of 1695:

The Branch of the Lodge of Solomon’s Temple, afterwards call’d the Lodge of St. John of Jerusalem . . . is . . . the Antientest and Purest now on Earth. The famous old Scottish Lodge of Kilwinning of which all the Kings of Scotland have been from Time to Time Grand Masters without Interruption down from the days of Fergus, who Reign’d there more than 2000 Years ago, long before the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem or the Knights of Maltha, to which two Lodges I must nevertheless allow the Honour of having adorn’d the Antient Jewish and Pagan Masonry with many Religious and Christian Rules.

Fergus being eldest Son to the chief King of Ireland, was carefully instructed in all the Arts and Sciences, especially the natural Magick, and the Caballistical Philosophy (afterwards called the Rosecrution) by the pagan Druids of Mona, the only true Cabalists then Extant in the Western World . . .

Fergus before his Descent upon the Picts in Scotland rais’d that famous Structure, call’d to this Day Carrick-Fergus, the most misterious Piece of Architecture now on Earth, (not excepting the Pyramids of the Egyptian Masons, and their Hieroglyphicks or Free Masons signs) . . . he built it as a Lodge for a College of Free Masons in those days call’d Druids . . .¹⁹⁵

When Swift claimed that “all the Kings of Scotland without interruption” have been Grand Masters, he obviously included the deposed James VII.

While at Kilroot, Swift worked on *A Tale of a Tub*, which he had started at Trinity and which further suggests his acquaintance with Masons interested in Cabalism and Rosicrucianism. The earliest part of *A Tale* was the allegory of a dying father who bequeaths each of his three sons a new coat, with instructions to care for it and to “live together in one House like Brethren and Friends, for then you will be sure to thrive, and not otherwise.”¹⁹⁶ The allegory drew on earlier versions of the story of three rings, which represented the Jewish, Christian, and Moslem religions. Swift made the three broth-

¹⁹⁵ J. Swift, *Prose*, V, 328–29.

¹⁹⁶ Jonathan Swift, *A Tale of a Tub*, eds. A.C. Guthkelch and D.N. Smith, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1958), 74.

ers and their coats represent the Papist (Peter), Episcopalian (Martyn), and Presbyterian-Dissenter (Jack) factions of the Christian church. Having experienced the Jacobite-Williamite struggles in Dublin, he was further moved in Ulster to satirize the bitter sectarian hostilities which undermined church and state in Britain. By 1695 economic conditions in Scotland had deteriorated so badly that thousands of Presbyterians migrated to Ulster, where they were soon at loggerheads with the Episcopal establishment, which felt increasingly betrayed by William's concessions to the non-conformists. It was a volatile atmosphere of rising Scottish nationalism, Covenanting radicalism, and anti-Papist fervor—in other words, an ominous replay of 1638.

In his satire, when Swift targeted the enthusiastic, zealous, bigoted, and “Illuminated” Jack, he connected radical Presbyterian-Dissenter beliefs with the original German Rosicrucian movement. Guthkelch notes that Swift's subtitle—“Written for the Universal Improvement of Mankind”—was taken from Boccalini's *Ragguagli de Parnaso*, which was partially reprinted with the *Fama Fraternitatis*.¹⁹⁷ The parts of *A Tale* that seem most likely to have been written in Kilroot describe scathingly the Scots who made grandiose claims for their ancient lineage (the Gathelus and Scota foundation myth), who preached seditiously against the Episcopal church and English regime, and who claimed Rosicrucian and Cabalistic illumination.¹⁹⁸ Swift even got in jabs against the Order of the Thistle and the Judaized Scots' aversion to pork.¹⁹⁹ The current heirs of John Knox (“Knocking Jack of the North”) could only organize their “Epidemick Sect of Aeolists” because the Anglican church (Martyn) “at this time happened to be extremely flegmatick and sedate.” Certainly, this was the case in Kilroot, where the Episcopal ministers were so negligent that their parishioners had to attend Presbyterian services if they wanted any Protestant church experience at all.

Swift read widely in Hermetic and Rosicrucian literature—including Paracelsus, Boehme, Sendivogius, Heydon, Thomas Vaughan, and the *Comte de Gabalis*, as well as their parodists Buckingham, Shadwell, and Butler.²⁰⁰ But his precise description of the seditious Presbyterian Jack as the “illuminated” founder of the “Sect of Aeolists”

¹⁹⁷ Ibid., 353.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid., 58, 99, 138–39, 153–54.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid., 48, 50.

²⁰⁰ See the “Notes on Dark Authors”; *ibid.*, 353–60.

suggests his observation of actual Scottish Rosicrucians and/or Freemasons in Ulster. From the contemporary career of the Ulster-bred and Glasgow-educated John Toland, who moved from Catholicism to Anglicanism to Rosicrucianism and who attempted to establish a Masonic-style radical "sect," Swift seemed to draw on actual acquaintances and observations of similar "illuminati."²⁰¹ By the time Swift published *A Tale of a Tub* in 1704, he shared the disillusionment of many Scots-Irish Williamites with the effects of the Glorious Revolution.

Swift's *Tale* and *Letter* provide a rare glimpse of "Celtic" developments in occult and chivalric Freemasonry between 1688 and 1695—a period when few other documents survive. That he had inside knowledge about those secretive affairs is reinforced by the later historical claims of Andrew Michael Ramsay, who studied and admired Swift's works and considered him a kindred spirit.²⁰² An exiled Scot and convert to "universalist" Catholicism, Ramsay wrote Swift to thank him for supporting *The Travels of Cyrus* (1727), Ramsay's allegorical novel, which was suffused with Jacobite and Masonic themes.²⁰³ A decade later, Ramsay revealed to the *Écossais* lodge in Paris a Jacobite version of Masonic history that echoed and elaborated many of Swift's revelations in *A Letter from the Grand Mistress*.

Swift stressed the Jewish roots of Masonry, noting that it was originally called Cabala, and he revealed the initiates' preoccupation with Cabalistic *gematria* and *notarikon*.²⁰⁴ Ramsay similarly stressed the Jewish origins and Cabalistic descent, noting that "The secret Science can be preserved pure only amongst God's people," the Jews, because the Masons' traditions

... are founded on the annals of the most ancient race in the world,
the only one still in existence with the same name as of old and not

²⁰¹ See F.H. Heinemann, "John Toland and the Age of Enlightenment," *Review of English Studies*, 20 (1944), 127–28; J.G. Simms, "John Toland (1670–1722), a Donegal Heretic," *Irish Historical Studies*, 16 (1969), 304–20; Margaret Jacob, *The Radical Enlightenment: Pantheists, Freemasons, and Republicans* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1981), 144–81.

²⁰² For their Masonic relationship, see M.K. Schuchard, "Ramsay, Swift, and the Jacobite-Masonic Version of the Stuart Restoration," in Joscelyn Godwin, ed., *Esoterisme, Gnoses et Imaginaire Symbolique: Mélanges Offerts à Antoine Faivre* (Louvain: Peeters, 2001), 491–505.

²⁰³ See *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift*, ed. Harold Williams (Oxford: Clarendon, 1963), III, 225, 331; Albert Cherel, *Un Adventurier Religieux au XVIII^e Siècle, A.M. Ramsay* (Paris, 1926).

²⁰⁴ J. Swift, *Prose*, V, 325–30.

intermingled with other nations although so widely dispersed and also the only one that has preserved its ancient books, whereas those of almost all other races are lost.²⁰⁵

While Swift referred to the preservation of Jewish secrets in lodges of “the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem or the Knights of Maltha,” Ramsay described the concealment of Solomon’s hieroglyphic writing (“the original Code of our Order”) in the foundations of the Second Temple and its subsequent discovery by the crusading knights who liberated Jerusalem. Some German initiates of *Écossais* lodges later claimed that Ramsay served as “Vicarius” under the Earl of Perth in the Templar order until 1708.²⁰⁶ It is unclear whether this obscure tradition referred to James Drummond, Fourth Earl and First Duke of Perth, who died in 1716, or to his son James, Fifth Earl and Second Duke, who returned to Scotland in 1695, participated in Jacobite plotting in 1707, and died in 1720. Though the claim about Ramsay seems implausible, the Germans drew on an oral tradition of a special Templar division of Freemasonry which supported the Stuarts from the seventeenth-century onwards.

According to Swift and Ramsay, when the crusaders returned to Europe, they infused the Solomonic secrets of Cabalism and Temple-building into their lodges. More explicitly than Swift, Ramsay named “James, Lord Steward of Scotland” as “Grand Master of a Lodge established at Kilwinning” in 1286, when he also initiated the English Earl of Gloucester and the Irish Earl of Ulster. Obliquely identifying early Masonry with the Templars, Ramsay noted that “an intimate union” was formed with the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem (the Hospitallers). Unlike Swift, he did not mention the Knights of Malta, who subsequently absorbed Templar and Hospitaller traditions and who underwent a short-lived revival in Ireland during James II’s residence there in 1690. Since the merging of the chivalric orders into Masonry, the brothers continued to imitate their Jewish forefathers: “The union was made after the manner of the Israelites when they built the Second Temple, whilst some handled the trowel and the compasses, others defended them with sword and buckler.”

²⁰⁵ C. Batham, “Ramsay,” 301–02.

²⁰⁶ W. Zimmerman, *Von den alten*, 375.

Though little documentation survives concerning Freemasonry at the turn of the seventeenth century, the seeds were already planted for the almost startling growth of the fraternity in the eighteenth century. After the accession of the Elector of Hanover to the British throne in 1714, the suppression of the Jacobite rebellion of 1715, and the exposure of the Jacobite-Swedish plot of 1716, a rival system of "modern" Hanoverian Freemasonry was established in 1717, and it struggled in bitter competition with the "ancient" Stuart system until 1813. Outside of Britain, the "ancients" recruited many more followers and became associated with nationalist movements in Eastern Europe and North and South America. For these liberationists, the Scottish traditions of resistance to foreign domination and mystical elevation of ordinary men to brotherhood with kings seemed fraught with contemporary relevance.

Throughout the eighteenth century, the "ancient" Stuart traditions were maintained in clandestine Jacobite lodges in Britain and in the *Écossais* lodges of the Stuart diaspora. As I will demonstrate in future books, the Jewish associations were carried on by Francis Francia (the "Jacobite Jew"), Dr. Samuel Jacob Falk (the "Baal Shem of London"), Martines de Pasqually (the "Élu Cohen"), and Count Cagliostro (the "Grand Cophta"); the Swedish-Stuart loyalties were preserved by Carl XII, Carl Gustaf Tessin, Carl Gyllenborg, Emanuel Swedenborg, and Gustaf III; the Scottish architectural agenda was transmitted by William Bruce, the Earl of Mar, James Gibbs, and the Earl of Burlington; the Cabalistic-Hermetic mysticism was expressed by Swift, Pope, Byrom, Ramsay, Casanova, St. Martin, Goethe, Herder, Lavater, Oetinger, Louthembourg, Cosway, Blake, Novikov, and Mozart. The Stuart Masonic belief in religious toleration was affirmed by Theodore I in Corsica; Stanislaus Leszczyński, Czartorisky, and Kosciuszko in Poland; Voltaire, Montesquieu, and Lafayette in France; Frederick the Great in Prussia; Franklin, Paine, Jefferson, and Washington in America.

Thus, when Mozart portrayed a chorus of Egyptian priests who escort the initiate into the Masonic Temple of Wisdom, and when Washington imported Scottish stonemasons to construct the American Capitol as a Temple of Liberty, they bore the fruits of a Masonic tree planted long ago in the stony soil of Israel and Scotland.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations

<i>AH</i>	<i>Architectural History</i>
<i>AQC</i>	<i>Ars Quatuor Coronatorum</i>
<i>CSP</i>	<i>Calendar of State Papers</i>
<i>DNB</i>	<i>Dictionary of National Biography</i>
<i>EJ</i>	<i>Encyclopaedia Judaica</i> (Jerusalem, 1972)
<i>HJ</i>	<i>Hermetic Journal</i>
<i>HMC</i>	<i>Historical Manuscripts Commission</i>
<i>JWCI</i>	<i>Journal of Warburg and Courtauld Institute</i>
<i>MJHSE</i>	<i>Miscellanies of Jewish Historical Society of England</i>
<i>SHR</i>	<i>Scottish Historical Review</i>
<i>TJHSE</i>	<i>Transactions of Jewish Historical Society of England</i>

Manuscripts

Bodleian Library, Oxford

Ashmole MSS. 949 and 1488.

MS. Top. Gen.c.25.ff.153. John Aubrey, "Chronologia Architectonica" (1671-).

Dolben MS. Add.C.302.ff.79-80. Robert Moray to Gilbert Sheldon.

—, Add.C.302.ff.92-93. Andrew Rutherford and Gilbert Sheldon.

British Library, London

Add. MSS. 39830. Tresham Papers, III.

Evelyn MS. 20a. "Catalogus Evelynianus."

—, MS. 65.f.243. On "the Free-Mason."

Harley Papers. Add. MS. 29/181.ff.3, 15. Robert Moray to Edward Harley.

Sloane MS. 3505.f.218-39. William Maxwell's Hermetic MSS., given to Bishop Joseph Hall.

—, MS. 1046. David Ramsay, "Liber Philosophicus."

Edinburg University Library

MS.DC.I.30. Patrick Ruthven's Alchemical MSS.

MS.DC.I.70. Robert Moray to Earl of Lauderdale.

National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh

ACC 9769. Personal Papers from the Muniments of the Earl of Crawford and Balcarres.

—, MS. 12/5/19. Schaw's Letter to Menmuir (October 1596).

—, MS. 14/8/1-2. David Lindsay's Notebook and Astronomical Treatise (1603).

—, MS. 14/2/2. Catalogue of Books of Earl of Dunfermline at Pinkie (1625).

—, MS. 29.f.243. Robert Moray to Charles II.

MS. 5818. Catalogue of the Family Library at Newbattle (1666): "Kerr's Library."

MS. 5774. Newbattle Collection.

MS. 5049-5050. Kincardine Papers. Typed transcript.

Royal College of Physicians, Eindburgh

Sir George Erskine Alchemical MSS., vols. I–VI.

Royal Society, London

MS. Register Book (C), IX. Thomas Martin, "Narrative of the Free Masons Word and Signs" (1659).

Sheffield University Library

"The Hartlib Papers." Electronic Edition (Ann Arbor: UMI, 1995).

Books, Articles, and Dissertations
[University presses are abbreviated as UP]

- Aberg, Alf, "Scottish Soldiers in the Swedish Armies in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," in G. Simpson, *Scotland and Scandinavia*, 90–99.
- Abraham, Lyndy, *Marvell and Alchemy* (Aldershot: Scolar, 1990).
- Abrahams, Dudley, "Jew Brokers of the City of London," *MJHSE*, 111 (1937), 87–88.
- Abrahams, Israel, "The Decalogue in Art," in J. Guttmann, *No Graven Images*, 19–55. *Acts of the Privy Council of England, 1613–1614* (London, 1821).
- Adamson, Henry, *The Muses Threnodie* (Edinburgh: George Anderson, 1638).
- Adamson, J.S.A., "Chivalry and Political Culture in Caroline England," in P. Lake *Culture and Politics*, 161–97.
- Adamson, John, ed., *The Muses Welcome to the High and Mightie Prince James* (Edinburgh: Thomas Finlaison, 1618).
- Addison, Charles G., *The Knights Templar History*, ed. Robert Macoy (1842; New York: AMS, 1978).
- Ahonen, Kathleen, "Johann Rudolph Glauber: A Study of Animism in Seventeenth-century Chemistry" (University of Michigan, Ph.D. Dissertation, 1972).
- Ailesbury, Thomas Bruce, Earl of, *Memoirs of Thomas, Earl of Ailesbury*. Roxburghe Club (Westminster: Nichols, 1890).
- Airs, Malcolm, *The Buildings of Britain: Tudor and Jacobean* (London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1982).
- , *The Making of the English Country House, 1500–1640* (London: Architectural Press, 1975).
- Airy, Osmund, "The Correspondence of Sir Robert Moray with Alexander Bruce, Second Earl of Kincardine," *Scottish Review*, 5 (1885), 22–43.
- , ed., *The Lauderdale Papers*, Camden Society, n.s., vols. 34, 36, 38 (Westminster, 1884–85).
- , ed., "Letters Addressed to the Earl of Lauderdale," *Camden Miscellany*, VIII (1883), Part 6.
- Aitkin, George, *The Life and Works of John Arbuthnot* (1898; rpt. New York: Russell, 1968).
- Akerman, Susanna, *Queen Christina of Sweden and Her Circle* (Leiden: Brill, 1991).
- , "Queen Christina's *Sefer-ha Razel* Manuscript," in A. Coudert, *Judaeo-Christian Intellectual Culture*, 13–25.
- , *Rose Cross Over the Baltic: The Spread of Rosicrucianism in Northern Europe* (Leiden: Brill, 1998).
- Al-Bakri, *Description de l'Afrique Septentrionale*, rev. ed., trans. Mac Guckin de Slane (Paris: Librairie d'Amérique et d'Orient, 1965).
- Alsted, Johann Heinrich, *Encyclopaedia* (1630; facs. rpt. Stuttgart: Fromman, 1989).
- Amama, Sixtini, *Anti-Barbarus Biblicus* (Amsterdam: Henry Laurentium, 1628).
- Ames, Joseph, *Typographical Antiquities* (London: W. Faden, 1749).

- Anderson, James, *The Constitutions of the Freemasons (1723) and (1738)*. (facs. rpt. Abingdon: Burgess, 1976).
- Andreae, Johan Valentin, *Christianopolis*, trans. Edward Thompson (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1999).
- Archenholz, Johan, *Mémoires Concernant Christine Reine de Suède* (Amsterdam: Pierre Mortier et Jean Schreuder, 1751–60).
- Arlington, Henry Bennet, Earl of, *The Right Honourable Earl of Arlington's Letters to Sir William Temple, Bar.*, ed. Thomas Babington (London: Thomas Bennett, 1701).
- Armitage, Edward, "Robert Samber," *AQC*, 11 (1898), 103–32.
- Ashmole, Elias, *The Institution, Laws, and Ceremonies of the Most Noble Order of the Garter* (1672; facs. rpt. London: Frederick Muller, 1971).
- , *Theatrum Chemicum Britannicum (1652)*, ed. Allen Debus (New York: Johnson Reprint, 1967).
- Aubrey, John, *Brief Lives*, ed. Andrew Clark (Oxford: Clarendon, 1898).
- , *Miscellanies*, 2nd rev. ed. (London: Bettesworth and Baltley, 1721).
- , *Monumenta Britannica*, ed. Rodney Legg and John Fowles (Milborne: Dorset, 1980).
- , *Remains of Gentilisme and Judaisme*, ed. James Britten (London: Satchell and Peyton, 1881).
- Auld, William, *The Free-Mason's Pocket Companion* (Edinburgh: Ruddiman and Auld, 1761).
- Backscheider, Paula, *Daniel Defoe: His Life* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1989).
- Bacon, Francis, *The Advancement of Learning and The New Atlantis*, ed. Arthur Johnston (Oxford: Clarendon, 1974).
- , *The Works of Francis Bacon*, eds. James Spedding, Robert Ellis, and Douglas Heath (New York: Garrett, 1968).
- Bacon, Roger, *The Opus Majus*, trans. Robert Burke (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania UP, 1928).
- Baer, Yitzah, *A History of the Jews in Christian Spain*, trans. Louis Schoffmann (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1971).
- Baigent, Michael, "Freemasonry, Hermetic Thought, and the Royal Society of London," *AQC*, 109 (1996), 154–66.
- , "The Painting of the 'Judgement of Solomon' at Culross 'Palace,'" *AQC*, 106 (1993), 154–71.
- , and Richard Leigh, *The Temple and the Lodge* (1989; London: Corgi, 1993).
- , and Bernard Williamson, "Sir Christopher Wren and Freemasonry: New Evidence," *AQC*, 109 (1996), 188–89.
- Balcarres, Colin Lindsay, Third Earl of, *Memoirs of the Revolution in Scotland, 1688–1690*. Bannatyne Club, 71 (Edinburgh, 1841).
- Barber, Richard, *The Knight and Chivalry*, 2nd ed. (Ipswich: Boydell, 1974).
- Barbour, John, *The Bruce*, ed. Walter Skeat (Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1894).
- Bargebuhr, Frederick, "The Alhambra Palace of the Eleventh Century," *JWCI*, 19 (1956), 192–258.
- Barnett, R.D., "Mr. Pepys' Contacts with the Spanish and Portuguese Jews in London," *TJHSE*, 29 (1986), 27–33.
- Baron, Salo, *Ancient and Medieval Jewish History*, ed. Leon Feldman (New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1972).
- , *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, 2nd rev. ed. (1937; New York: Columbia UP, 1966).
- Baroway, Israel, "Toward Understanding Tudor-Jacobean Hebrew Studies," *Jewish Social Studies*, 18 (1956), 17–23.
- Barrett, John, *An Essay on the Earlier Life of Jonathan Swift* (London: J. Johnson, 1808).
- Barrow, Geoffrey, "The Idea of Freedom in Late Medieval Scotland," *Innes Review*, 30 (1979), 16–34.

- , and Ann Royan, "James Fifth Stewart of Scotland, 1260?–1309," in K. Stringer, *Essays*, 166–87.
- Bartlett, John, ed., *The First and Second Book of Maccabees* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1973).
- Batham, Charles, "Chevalier Ramsay—a New Appreciation," *AQC*, 81 (1968), 280–310.
- Baxter, Richard, *The Autobiography of Richard Baxter*, ed. J.M.L. Thomas (London: J.M. Dent, 1931).
- Bayard, Jean-Pierre, *Le Compagnonnage en France* (Paris: Éditions Payot, 1977).
- Beasley, A.W., "The Disability of James VI and I," *The Seventeenth Century*, 10 (1995), 52–62.
- Bedard, R.A., "Wren's Mausoleum for Charles I and the Cult of the Royal Martyr," *AH*, 27 (1984), 36–47.
- Bedford, W.K.R. and Richard Holbeche, *The Order of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem* (London: F.E. Robinson, 1978).
- Beeler, Stanley, "Johann Valentin Andreae," in James Hardin, ed., *Dictionary of Literary Biography, Vol. 164: German Baroque Writers, 1580–1660* (Detroit: Gale Research, 1996), 13–19.
- Behre, Göran, "Gothenburg in Stuart War Strategy, 1649–1760," in G. Simpson, *Scotland and Scandinavia*, 90–99.
- Beltz, George, *Memorials of the Most Noble Order of the Garter* (1841; facs. rpt. New York: AMS, 1972).
- Benady, T.M., "The Role of Jews in the British Colonies of the Western Mediterranean," *TJHSE*, 33 (1992), 45–63.
- Bennett, J.A., *The Mathematical Science of Christopher Wren* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982).
- Béresniak, Daniel, *Symbols of Freemasonry*, trans. Ian Monk (Paris: Assouline, 1997).
- Berg, J. van den and Ernestine van der Wall, *Jewish-Christian Relations in the Seventeenth Century* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1988).
- Bernard, Edward, *Catalogus Librorum Manuscriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae* (Oxford: Sheldonian Theatre, 1697).
- Bernays, Jacob, *Joseph Justus Scaliger* (1855; New York: Burt Franklin, 1965).
- Bertellot, J., "Les franc-maçons devant l'Histoire," *Monde Nouveau* (1949), 43–44.
- Birch, Thomas, *The Court and Times of Charles I* (London: Henry Colburn, 1848).
- , *The History of the Royal Society* (London: A. Millar, 1756–57).
- Black, George, "The Beginnings of the Study of Hebrew in Scotland," in Louis Ginsburg, ed., *Studies in Jewish Bibliography* (New York: Alexander Kohut Memorial Fund, 1929), 463–78.
- Blau, Joseph, *The Christian Interpretation of the Cabala in the Renaissance* (New York: Columbia UP, 1976).
- Bloom, Herbert, *The Economic Activities of the Jews of Amsterdam in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Williamspoint: Bayard, 1937).
- Blumenthal, David, *Understanding Jewish Mysticism: The Merkabah Tradition and the Zoharic Tradition* (New York: Ktav, 1978).
- Blunt, Anthony, "The Hypnerotomachia Poliphili in Seventeenth-century France," *JWCI*, 1 (1937), 117–37.
- Boccalini, Traiano, *Ragguagli di Parnasso: or, Advertisements from Parnassus*, 3rd rev. ed., trans. Henry, Earl of Monmouth (London: Peter Parker, 1674).
- Bodin, Jean, *Colloquium of the Seven about Secrets of the Sublime*, trans. Marion Kuntz (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1975).
- , *The Six Books of a Commonweale*, ed. Kenneth McRae (1606; facs. rpt. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1962).
- Boece, Hector, *The History and Chronicles of Scotland*, trans. John Bellenden (Edinburgh: W. and C. Tait, 1821).

- , *Murthalacensium et Aberdonensium Episcoporum Vitae*, trans. James Moir (Aberdeen: New Spalding Club, 1894).
- Boehme, Jacob, *Forty Questions Concerning the Soul*, 2nd ed., trans. John Sparrow (1647; London: Matthew Simmons, 1665).
- , *Mysterium Magnum*, trans. J. Ellistone and John Sparrow (London: Matthew Simmons, 1654).
- Bold, John, *John Webb: Architectural Theory and Practice in the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989).
- Bonner, Anthony, *Doctor Illuminatus: A Ramon Lull Reader* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1993).
- Bonneville, Nicholas, *La Maçonnerie Écossoise comparée avec les Trois Professions et le Secret de Templiers du 14^e Siècle* (Orient de Londres [Hamburg], 1788).
- Bord, Gustave, *La Franc-Maçonnerie en France de Origines à 1815* (Paris: Nouvelle Librairie Nationale, 1908).
- Bossy, John, *Giordano Bruno and the Embassy Affair* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1991).
- Bower, Walter, *Scotichronicon*, ed. D.E.R. Watt (Aberdeen: Aberdeen UP, 1987).
- Brett-James, Norman, *The Growth of Stuart London* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1935).
- Brockman, C. Lance, ed., *Theatre of the Fraternity: Staging the Ritual Space of the Scottish Rite of Freemasonry* (Minneapolis: Frederick R. Wiseman Art Museum, 1996).
- Braun, Dauvit, R.J. Finlay, and Michael Lynch, eds., *Image and Identity: The Re-making of Scotland through the Ages* (Edinburg: John Donald, 1998).
- Brown, E.A. and M.W. Cothren, "The Twelfth-century Crusading Window of the Abbey of Saint-Denis," *JWCI*, 49 (1988), 1–40.
- Brown, Harcourt, *Scientific Organizations in Seventeenth-century France, 1620–1680* (Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins, 1934).
- Brown, P. Hume, *George Buchanan: Humanist and Reformer* (Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1890).
- Browning, Andrew, ed., *Memoirs of Sir John Reresby* (Glasgow: Jackson, 1936).
- Buchanan, George, *The History of Scotland*, 7th ed., trans. Bond (Glasgow: Chapman and Laing, 1799).
- , *The Sacred Dramas of George Buchanan*, trans. Archibald Brown (Edinburgh: James Thin, 1906).
- , *The Tyrannous Reign of Mary Stewart*, trans. W.A. Gatherer, intro. Michael Lynch (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1958).
- Buckingham, George Villiers, Duke of, *The Rehearsal*, ed. D.E.L. Crane (Durham: Durham UP, 1976).
- Bühle, Johann G., *Über den Ursprung und die vornehmsten Schicksale der Orden der Rosenkreuzer und Freymaurer* (Göttingen, 1804).
- Bullock, Alfred, *Some Sculptured Works by Nicholas Stone* (London: B.T. Batsford, 1908).
- Burnet, Gilbert, *Burnet's History of My Own Time*, ed. Osmund Airy (Oxford: Clarendon, 1897).
- , *The Memoirs of the Lives and Actions of the Dukes of Hamilton* (London: J. Grover, 1677).
- Büsching, A.F. von, *Beträge zu der Lebensgeschichte Denkwürdiger Personen* (Halle, 1783–89).
- Butler, Samuel, *Characters*, ed. Charles Davis (Cleveland: Case Western Reserve UP, 1970).
- , *Hudibras, Parts I and II, and Selected Other Writings*, eds. John Wilders and Hugh de Quehen (Oxford: Clarendon, 1973).
- , *Prose Observations*, ed. Hugh de Quehen (Oxford: Clarendon, 1979).
- , *Satires and Miscellaneous Poetry and Prose*, ed. René Lamar (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1928).
- Cahn, Walter, "Solomonic Elements in Romanesque Art," in J. Guttmann, *Temple, Caledonia's Farewell* (Edinburgh: Heir of Andrew Anderson, 1685).

- CSP. *Domestic Series, of the Reign of Charles I, 1625–1649* (London, 1858–1897).
 CSP. *Domestic Series, of the Reign of Charles II, 1660–1685* (London, 1860–1939).
 CSP. *Domestic Series, of the Reign of James I, 1603–1625* (London, 1857).
 CSP. *Foreign Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1560–1561* (London, 1865).
 CSP. *Relating to Scotland and Mary, Queen of Scots, 1547–1603* (Edinburgh, 1936–69).
 Calhoun, Thomas, *Henry Vaughan: The Achievement of "Silex Scintillans"* (Newark: Delaware UP, 1981).
 Cameron, Jamie, *James V: The Personal Role*, ed. Norman Macdougall (East Linton: Tuckwell, 1998).
 Campbell, John, *Biographia Britannica* (London, 1747).
 Cardan, Jerome, *The Book of My Life*, trans. Jean Stoner (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1930).
 Carr, Harry, "A Collection of References to the Mason Word," *AQC*, 85 (1972), 217–41.
 —, *The Minutes of the Lodge of Edinburgh, Mary's Chapel, No. 1 (1598–1738)* (London, 1962).
 Cebes, the Theban, *The Tablatura of Cebes the Theban, a Disciple of Socrates, Being an Allegorical Picture of Human Life*, 3rd ed., trans. Samuel Boyse (Glasgow: Robert and Andrew Foulis, 1750).
 Chaney, Edward, *The Evolution of the Grand Tour* (London: Frank Cass, 1998).
 Charles I, *Eikon Basilike: The Portraiture of His Sacred Majesty in His Solitudes and Sufferings*, ed. Philip Knachel (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1966).
 Cherel, Albert, *Un Adventurier Religieux au XVIII^e Siècle, A.M. Ramsay* (Paris: Perrin, 1926).
 Chevalier, Charles, "Maçons écossais au XVIII^e siècle," *Annales Historiques de la Révolution Française* (September 1969), 393–408.
 Chevallier, Pierre, *Histoire de la Franc-Maçonnerie Française* (Paris: Fayard, 1974).
 —, *Louis XIII—Roi Cornélian* (Paris: Fayard, 1979).
 Christianson, John, *On Tycho's Island: Tycho Brahe and His Assistants* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000).
 Clarendon, Henry Hyde, Earl of, *The History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England*, ed. W.D. Macray (Oxford: Clarendon, 1888).
 Clark, Jane, "Lord Burlington is Here," in Toby Bernard and Jane Clark, eds., *Lord Burlington: Art, Architecture, Art, and Life* (London: Hambledon, 1995), 251–310.
 Clarke, J.R., "Was Sir Christopher Wren a Freemason?", *AQC*, 78 (1965), 201–06.
 Clarke, T.E.S. and H.C. Foxcroft, *A Life of Gilbert Burnet* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1907).
 Cleland, James, *The Institution of a Young Noble Man (1607)*, ed. Max Molyneux (New York: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1948).
 —, *Jacob's Well and Abbot's Conduit Paralleled* (London: Robert Allot, 1626).
 —, *A Monument of Mortality Upon the Death of Lodovick, Duke of Richmond* (London: William Stansby, 1624).
 Cleveland, John, *The Poems of John Cleveland*, eds. Brian Morris and Eleanor Withington (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967).
 Clulee, Nicholas, *John Dee's Natural Philosophy: Between Science and Religion* (London: Routledge, 1988).
 Colie, Rosalie, *Some Thankfulness to Constantine* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1956).
 Colonna, Francesco, *The Hyperotomachia or Dream of Poliphilus*, ed. Adam McLean (Glasgow: Magnum Opus Sourceworks, 1986).
 —, *Hyperotomachia: The Strife of Love in a Dream (1592)*, trans. R.D., introd. Lucy Gent (Delmar: Scholars' Facsimile and Reprints, 1973).
 —, *Hyperotomachia Poliphili: The Strife of Love in a Dream*, trans. Joscelyn Godwin (London: Thames and Hudson, 1999).

- Colvin, Howard, "Aubrey's *Chronologica Architectonica*," in J. Summerson, *Concerning Architecture*, 1–12.
- , *A Biographical Dictionary of British Architects, 1600–1840*, 3rd ed. (New Haven: Yale UP, 1995).
- , *Essays on English Architectural History* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1999).
- , *The History of the King's Works* (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1963).
- , "A Scottish Origin for English Palladianism," *AH*, 17 (1974), 168–82.
- Conder, Edward, "King Charles II at the Royal Exchange in London in 1662," *AQC*, 11 (1898), 138–45.
- , *Records of the Hole Crafte and Fellowship of Masons*, eds. Louis Williams and Robin Carr (1894; facs. rpt. Bloomington: Masonic Book Club, 1988).
- Conway, Anne, *Conway Letters*, ed. Marjorie Nicholson (New Haven: Yale UP, 1930).
- Conybeare, Frederick, *Philo: About the Contemplative Life* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1895).
- Cooper, M.A.R., "Robert Hooke's Work as Surveyor for the City of London in the Aftermath of the Great Fire," *Notes and Records of the Royal Society*, 51 (1997), 161–74; 52 (1998), 25–38, 205–20.
- Cooper, Henry, *A Philosophical Epitaph in Hieroglyphical Figures . . . With a Catalogue of Chymical Books* (London, 1673).
- Coornaert, Emile, *Les Compagnonnages en France du Moyen Age à Nos Jours* (Paris: Éditions Ouvrières, 1966).
- Cornforth, John and Oliver Hill, *English Country Houses: Caroline (1625–1685)* (London: Country Life, 1966).
- Corp, Edward, *L'Autre Exil: Les Jacobites en France au début du XVIII^e Siècle* (Presses du Languedoc, 1993).
- , *Lord Burlington—The Man and His Politics* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1998).
- , "Melfort: a Jacobite Connoisseur," *History Today* (October 1995), 41–46.
- , and Eveline Cruickshanks, eds., *The Stuart Court in Exile and the Jacobites* (London: Hambledon, 1995).
- Coste, M.E. de la, *Anselme Adorne* (Brussels, 1855).
- Coudert, Allison, *The Impact of the Kabbalah in the Seventeenth Century: The Life and Thought of Francis Mercurius van Helmont* (Leiden: Brill, 1999).
- , *Leibniz and the Kabbalah* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1995).
- , "A Quaker-Kabbalist Controversy: George Fox's Reaction to Francis Mercury van Helmont," *JWCI*, 39 (1976), 170–89.
- , "Seventeenth-Century Christian Hebraists: Philosemites or Antisemites?," in A. Coudert, *Judaean-Christian Intellectual Culture*, 43–69.
- , and Sarah Hutton, Richard Popkin, Gordon Weiner, eds., *Judaean-Christian Intellectual Culture in the Seventeenth Century* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1999).
- Council, Norman, "Ben Jonson, Inigo Jones, and the Transformation of Tudor Chivalry," *English Literary History*, 47 (1980), 259–75.
- Cowan, Edward, "The Darker Vision of the Scottish Renaissance: the Devil and Francis Stewart," in Edward Cowan and Duncan Shaw, eds., *The Renaissance and Reformation in Scotland: Essays in Honour of Gordon Donaldson* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic, 1983), 125–40.
- , "Identity, Freedom, and the Declaration of Arbroath," in D. Broun, *Image and Identity*, 38–68.
- , "Myth and Identity in Early Medieval Scotland," *SHR*, 63 (1984), 111–35.
- Cowan, Ian, "The Reluctant Revolutionaries," in E. Cruickshanks, *By Force or Default*, 68–77.
- , and D.K. Easson, R.N. Hadcock, eds., *Medieval Religious Houses: Scotland*, 2nd ed. (London: Longman, 1976).
- , and P.H. Mackay, Alan Macquarrie, eds., *The Knights of St. John of Jerusalem in Scotland*. Scottish History Society, 4ths., IX (1983).

- Cowley, Abraham, *The Essays and Other Prose Writings*, ed. Alfred Gough (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968).
- , *Poems*, ed. A.R. Waller (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1905). Coxe, H.O., *Bodleian Library Quarto Catalogues, II: Laudian Manuscripts* (Oxford: Bodleian Library, 1973).
- Craig, W.S., *History of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh* (Oxford: Blackwell Scientific, 1976).
- Craven, J.B., "A Scottish Alchemist of the Seventeenth Century: David, Lord Balcarres," *Journal of Alchemical Society*, 1 (1913), 68–75.
- Crawford, Barbara, "William Sinclair, Earl of Orkney, and His Family: A Study in the Politics of Survival," in K. Stringer, *Essays*, 232–51.
- Crawley, Chetwode, "Rabbi Jacob Jehudah Leon," *AQC*, 12 (1899), 150–63.
- Crips, Doreen, *Elizabeth of the Sealed Knot: A Biography of Elizabeth Murray, Countess of Dysart* (Kineton: Roundwood, 1975).
- Crossle, Phillip, "Freemasonry in Ireland, circa 1725–31," *The Lodge of Research, No. CC. Ireland. Transactions for the Year 1924* (Dublin: G.F. Healey, 1931).
- [Crouch, Nathaniel], R.B., *Memorable Remarks Upon the Ancient and Modern State of the Jewish Nation* (Bolton: B. Jackson, 1786).
- Cruden, Stewart, *Scottish Medieval Churches* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1986).
- Cruikshanks, Eveline, ed., *By Force or Default? The Revolution of 1688–89* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1989).
- , *The Glorious Revolution* (London: MacMillan, 2000).
- Cuddy, Neil, "Anglo-Scottish Union and the Court of James I, 1603–1625," *Transactions of Royal Historical Society*, 5th s., 39 (1989), 109–24.
- , "The Revival of the Entourage: the Bedchamber of James I, 1603–1625," in David Starkey, ed., *The English Court: From the Wars of the Roses to the Civil War* (London: Longman's, 1987), 173–225.
- Curl, James, *The Art and Architecture of Freemasonry* (London: B.T. Batsford, 1991).
- , *The Londonderry Plantation, 1609–1914* (Chichester: Phillimore, 1986).
- Cutler, A.H. and H.E., *The Jew as Ally of the Muslim* (Notre Dame: Notre Dame UP, 1986).
- Dan, Joseph, Moshe Idel, and Ronald Keiner, eds., *The Early Kabbalah* (New York: Paulist, 1986).
- Davenant, William, *The Dramatic Works of Sir William Davenant* (Edinburgh: William Paterson, 1872).
- , *The Siege of Rhodes*, ed. Ann-Mari Hedböck (Uppsala: Rotobacken, 1973).
- Davidson, Hilda, *The Seer in Celtic and Other Traditions* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1989).
- Davison, Israel, *Selected Religious Poems of Solomon Ibn Gabirol* (1923; New York: Arno, 1973).
- Davison [or Davidson], William, *Les Elements de la Philosophie de l'Art du Feu ou Chemie*, trans. Jean Hellot (Paris: F. Piot, 1651).
- , *Philosophia Pyrotechnia* (Paris: J. Bessin, 1641).
- Deacon, Richard, *John Dee* (London: Frederick Muller, 1968).
- Dee, John, *The Diaries of John Dee*, ed. Edward Fenton (Charlbury: Day Books, 1998).
- , *A Letter Nine Yeeres Since, Written and First Published, Containing a Discourse Apologetical* (London: E. Short, 1603).
- , Preface to *The Elements of Geometrie of the Most Auncient Philosopher EUCLIDE of Megara*, trans. Henry Billingsley (London: John Daye, 1570).
- , *To the Honourable Assemblie of the Commons in the Present Parliament* (London, 1604).
- , *To the King's Most Excellent Majestie* (London, 1604).
- Delon, Francis, "Masonic Landscape Design," *AQC*, 111 (1998), 265.

- Denham, John, *The Poetical Works of Sir John Denham*, ed. Theodore Banks (1928; New Haven: Yale UP, 1969).
- Denison, Stephen, *The White Wolfe* (London: George Miller, 1627).
- Dickson, Donald, *The Tessera of Antilia: Utopian Brotherhoods and Secret Societies in the Early Seventeenth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 1998).
- , "Thomas Henshaw and Sir Robert Preston's Pursuit of the Red Elixir," *Notes and Records of the Royal Society*, 51 (1997), 57–76.
- Dielemans, Gerard, "Een Macconieke (liefde) Brief uit Maastricht A.D. 1658," *Acta Macconica*, 10 (2000), 147–85.
- Dietrich, P.A. and Duclow, D.F., "Virgins in Paradise: Deification and Exegesis in 'Periphyseon V,'" in G.H. Allard, ed., *Jean Scot Écrivain* (Paris: Cahiers d'Études Médiévales, 1986), 31–37.
- Dingwall, Helen, *Physicians, Surgeons, and Apothecaries: Medicine in Seventeenth-Century Edinburgh* (East Linton: Tuckwell, 1995).
- Donaldson, Gordon, ed., *Scotland: James V to James VII* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1965).
- , *Scottish Historical Documents* (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic, 1970).
- Donaldson, William, *The Jacobite Song* (Aberdeen: Aberdeen UP, 1988).
- Dorsten, Jan Van, "The Arts of Memory and Poetry," *English Studies*, 48 (1967), 413–25.
- , "Garter Knights and Familists," *Journal of European Studies*, 4 (1974), 178–88.
- , *The Radical Arts* (London: Oxford UP, 1970).
- Douglas, Gavin, *The Shorter Poems of Gavin Douglas*, ed. Priscilla Bawcutt (Edinburgh: Blackwood, 1967).
- Douglas, Robert, *The Baronage of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1798).
- Downes, Kerry, "John Evelyn and Architecture: a First Inquiry," in J. Summerson, *Concerning Architecture*, 28–39.
- , "Sir Christopher Wren, Edward Woodroffe, J.H. Mansart, and Architectural History," *AH*, 37 (1994), 37–63.
- Draffen, George, "The Alleged Templar Chapter at Edinburgh in 1745," *AQC*, 67 (1955), 53–60.
- , "Freemasonry in Scotland in 1717," *AQC*, 83 (1979), 366.
- , "The Schaw Statutes," *AQC*, 94 (1981), 138–40.
- Dreyer, J.L.E., *Tycho Brahe* (Edinburgh: A. and C. Black, 1890).
- Drummond, James, Earl of Perth, *Letters from James, Earl of Perth, Lord Chancellor of Scotland, to his Sister, the Countess of Erroll*, ed. William Jerdan. Camden Society, 33 (London, 1845).
- Drummond, William, of Hawthornden, *The History of Scotland*, 2nd ed., introd. M. Hall (London: T. Fabian, 1682).
- , *Poems and Prose*, ed. R.H. Macdonald (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic, 1976).
- Drusius, Johannes, *De Tribus Sectis Judaeorum*, ed. Sixtini Amama (Arnhem, 1619).
- , *Elohim sive de Nomine Dei* (Frankerae, 1604).
- John Dryden, *The Works of John Dryden*, eds. E.N. Hooker and H.T. Swedenberg (Berkeley: California UP, 1956–).
- Du Bartas, Sieur, *The Divine Weeks and Works*, trans. Joshua Sylvester, ed. Susan Snyder (Oxford: Clarendon, 1979).
- , *The Works of Guillaume Salluste Sieur Du Bartas*, eds. U.T. Holmes, J.C. Lyons, and R.W. Linker (Chapel Hill: North Carolina UP, 1935).
- Dugdale, William, *The History of St. Paul's Cathedral*, 2nd rev. ed. (1658; London: George James, 1716).
- Dunbar, John, "The Building Activities of the Duke and Duchess of Lauderdale," *Archaeological Journal*, 132 (1975), 202–30.
- , *Scottish Royal Palaces* (East Linton: Tuckwell, 1999).
- Durkan, John, "Alexander Dickson and S.T.C.," *The Bibliothek*, 3 (1962), 183–90.

- , "Buchanan's Judaizing Practices," *Innes Review*, 15 (1964), 186–87.
- , "The Royal Lectureships Under Mary of Lorraine," *SHR*, 62 (1983), 73–78.
- Dury, John, *A Case of Conscience, Whether It Be Lawful to Admit Jews into a Christian Commonwealth?* (London, 1656).
- , *An Information, Concerning the Present State of the Jewish Nation in Europe and Judea* (London: Brewster, 1658).
- , *Israel's Call to March Out of Babylon unto Jerusalem* (London, 1646).
- , *The Unchanged, Constant and Single-hearted Peace-maker . . . or, a Vindication of Mr. John Dury* (London: J. Clowes, 1650).
- "The Early Minute Book of the Lodge of Dundee," *AQC*, 67 (1955), 110.
- Edington, Carol, "Paragons and Patriots: National Identity and the Chivalric Ideal in Late-Medieval Scotland," in D. Broun, *Image and Identity*, 69–81.
- Edwards, G. Patrick, "William Elphinstone, His College Chapel, and the Second of April," *Aberdeen University Review*, 51 (1985), 1–17.
- Edwards, John, "The Hospitallers in Scotland in the Fifteenth Century," *SHR*, 9 (1912), 52–68.
- , "The Templars in Scotland," *SHR*, 5 (1908), 13–25.
- Eerde, Katherine S. van, *John Ogilby and the Taste of His Time* (Folkestone: William Dawson, 1976).
- Efros, Israel, *Studies in Medieval Jewish Philosophy* (New York: Columbia UP, 1974).
- Ehrenpreis, Irvin, *Swift: The Man, His Works, and the Age* (London: Methuen, 1962).
- Elizabeth, Queen of Bohemia, *The Letters of Elizabeth of Bohemia*, ed. L.M. Baker (London: Bodley Head, 1953).
- Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Jerusalem: Keter, 1972).
- Erskine-Hill, Howard, "Heirs of Vitruvius: Pope and the Idea of Architecture," in *The Art of Alexander Pope*, eds. Howard Erskine-Hill and Anne Smith (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1979), 144–56.
- , *Poetry and the Realm of Politics: Shakespeare to Dryden* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996).
- Evelyn, John, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, ed. E.S. de Beer (Oxford: Clarendon, 1955).
- , *The History of Religion*, ed. R.M. Evanson (London: Henry Colburn, 1850).
- , *The History of the Three Late Famous Impostors*, introd. C.W. Grose. Augustan Reprint Society, 131 (1669; Los Angeles: Clark Memorial Library, 1968).
- , *The Life of Mrs. Godolphin*, ed. Harriet Simpson (London: Oxford UP, 1939).
- , *The Miscellaneous Writings of John Evelyn*, ed. William Upcott (London: Henry Colburn, 1825).
- Fabre-Vassas, Claudine, *The Singular Beast: Jews, Christians, and the Pig*, trans. Carol Volk (New York: Columbia UP, 1997).
- Faivre, Antoine, "The Ancient and Medieval Sources of Modern Esoteric Movements," in Antoine Faivre and Jacob Needleman, eds., *Modern Esoteric Spirituality* (New York: Crossroad, 1995), 71–100.
- , *L'Ésoterisme au XVIII^e siècle en France et en Allemagne* (Paris: Seghers, 1973).
- Falconer, John, *Rules for Explaining and Deciphering All Manner of Secret Writing* (1685; London: Dan Brown, 1692).
- Farley, Henry, *The Complaint of Paules* (Cambridge: C. Legge, 1616).
- , *Portland-stone in Paules Church Yard* (London: G.E. for R.M., 1621).
- , *St. Paules-Church Her Bill for Parliament* (London, 1621).
- Favine, Andrew, *The Theatre of Honour and Knight-Hood* (London: William Iaggard, 1623).
- Fawcett, Richard, *Scottish Architecture: From the Accession of the Stewarts to the Reformation, 1371–1560* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1994).
- Fay, Bernard, "Les origines et l'esprit de la Franc-Maçonnerie," *La Revue Universelle*, 66 (1936), 167–82.

- Feingold, Mordecai, *The Mathematicians' Apprenticeship: Science, Universities, and Society in England, 1560-1640* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984).
- Fenwick, Hubert, *Architect Royal: The Life and Works of Sir William Bruce, 1630-1710* (Kington: Roundwood, 1970).
- Ferris, Eleanor, "The Financial Relations of the Knights Templar to the English Crown," *American Historical Review*, 8 (1902), 1-17.
- Feuer, Lewis, "Francis Bacon and the Jews: Who Was the Jew in the *New Atlantis*," *TJHSE*, 29 (1982-86), 1-25.
- Field, J.V. and F.A. James, *Renaissance and Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993).
- Fielding, Henry, *The Jacobite's Journal and Related Writings*, ed. W.B. Coley (Middletown: Wesleyan UP, 1975).
- Fierz, Marcus, *Girolamo Cardano, 1501-1576*, trans. Helga Niman (Boston: Burkhauser, 1983).
- Figala, Karin and U. Neumann, "Bio-bibliography of Michael Maier," in Piyo Rittansi and Antonio Clericuzio, eds., *Alchemy and Chemistry in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1994), 132-33.
- Firth, C.H., *Scotland and the Protectorate* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1899).
- Fletcher, John, ed., *Athanasius Kircher und seine Beziehungen zum gelehrten Europa seiner Zeit* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1988).
- Flinn, M.W., *Men of Iron: The Crowleys in the Early Iron Industry* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1962).
- Fludd, Robert, *Dr. Fludd's Answer unto Mr. Foster* (London: N. Butter, 1631).
- , *Mosaical Philosophy* (London: Humphrey Mosely, 1659).
- Fogarty, H.W., "Rosicrucianism," in Mircea Eliade, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Religion* (New York: Macmillan, 1987).
- Forey, A.J., "The Military Order of St. Thomas of Acre," *English Historical Review* (1977), 492-96.
- Fotheringham, J.G., ed., *The Diplomatic Correspondence of Jean de Montreuil and the Brothers de Bellièvre, French Ambassadors in England and Scotland, 1645-1648* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1899).
- Fowler, William, *The Works of William Fowler*, eds. H.W. Meikle, J. Craigie, and J. Purves (Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1940).
- Franco, Solomon, *Truth Springing Out of the Earth* (London: J. Flesher, 1668).
- Francovich, Carlo, *Storia della Massoneria in Italia* (Firenze: La Nuova Italia, 1974).
- Frankl, Paul, *The Gothic: Literary Sources and Interpretations Through Eight Centuries* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1960).
- Fraser, Antonia, *Mary Queen of Scots* (1969; New York: Dell, 1971).
- Fréart, Roland, Sieur de Chambry, *A Parallel of the Ancient Architecture with Modern*, trans. John Evelyn (London: Thomas Roycroft, 1664).
- Fremante, Katherine, *The Baroque Town Hall of Amsterdam* (Utrecht: Haentjens, Dekker, and Gambert, 1959).
- French, Peter, *John Dee: the World of an Elizabethan Magus* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972).
- Friedenwald, Harry, *The Jews and Medicine* (1944; New York: Ktav, 1967).
- Frizium, Joachim, *Summum bonum quod est veram Magiae, Cabale, Alchymiae, Fratrum Roseae Crucis verorum verae subjectum* (Frankfurt, 1629).
- Fujita, Shozo, "The Temple Theology of the Qumran Sect and the Book of Ezekiel," Princeton University, Ph.D. Dissertation, 1970.
- Fuller, John, *The History of the Worthies of England*, ed. P.A. Nutall (1662; London: Thomas Tegg, 1840).
- Fyfe, J.G., ed., *Scottish Diaries and Memoirs, 1550-1746* (Stirling: Eneas Mackay, 1928).
- Gade, John, *The Life and Times of Tycho Brahe* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1947).

- Galluzi, Paolo, "Motivi Paracelsiani nella Toscana di Cosimo II e di Don Antonio dei Medici: Alchemia, Medicina, 'Chimica,' e Riforma del Sapere," in *Scienze Credenze Occulte Livelli di Cultura* (Firenze: Leo Olschki, 1982), 31–48.
- Gärtner, Bertil, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1965).
- Gatti, Hilary, *Giordano Bruno and Renaissance Science* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1999).
- Gerbier, Balthazar, *A Brief Discourse . . . of Magnificent Building* (London, 1662).
- , *Counsel and Advice to All Builders* (London: Thomas Mabb, 1663).
- Gibbon, Edward, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, 1990).
- Gillespie, Charles, ed., *Dictionary of Scientific Biography* (New York: Scribner's, 1973).
- Ginzburg, Christian, *The Essenes and the Kabbalah* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955).
- Girouard, Mark, *Life in the English Country House* (1978; New Haven: Yale UP, 1980).
- Girouard, Robert, *Robert Smythson and the Elizabethan Country House* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1999).
- Glendinning, Miles, Ranald Macinnes, and Aonghus Mackechnie, eds., *A History of Scottish Architecture: From the Renaissance to the Present Day* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1996).
- Glozier, Matthew, "The Earl of Melfort, the Court Catholic Party and the Foundation of the Order of the Thistle," *SHR*, 79 (2000), 233–38.
- Godwin, Joscelyn, "Athanasius Kircher," in James Hardin, ed., in *Dictionary of Literary Biography, Vol. 164: German Baroque Writers, 1580–1660* (Detroit: Gale Research, 1996), 185–94.
- , "Athanasius Kircher and the Occult," in J. Fletcher, *Kircher*, 17–36.
- , *Athanasius Kircher: A Renaissance Man and the Quest for Lost Knowledge* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1979).
- , *Robert Fludd* (Boulder: Shambala, 1979).
- Goldie, Mark, "The Theory of Religious Intolerance in Restoration England," in O. Grell, *From Persecution*, 331–68.
- , "The Roots of True Whiggism," *History of Political Thought*, 1 (1980), 195–236.
- Goldsmith, Margaret, *Christina of Sweden* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1935).
- Gooch, Leo, *The Desperate Faction? The Jacobites of North-East England* (Hull: Hull UP, 1962).
- Goodare, Julian and Michael Lynch, eds., *The Reign of James the Sixth* (East Linton: Tuckwell, 2000).
- Goodenough, Erwin, "Early Christian and Jewish Art," in J. Guttman, *No Graven Images*, 409–16.
- , *By Light, Light: Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1935).
- , *Jewish Symbols in the Graeco-Roman Period* (New York: Pantheon, 1953).
- Goodricke, Charles, *Ribston . . . Seat of the Goodricke Family* (London, 1902).
- Gordon, D.J., "Poet and Architect: the Intellectual Setting of the Quarrel Between Ben Jonson and Inigo Jones," *JWCI*, 12 (1949), 159–75.
- Gordon, John, *Enotikon* (London: George Bishop, 1604).
- Gotch, J. Alfred, *A Complete Account of the Buildings Erected in Northamptonshire by Sir Thomas Tresham Between the Years 1575 and 1605* (London: Batsford, 1883).
- , *Inigo Jones* (London: Methuen, 1928).
- Gould, Robert Freke, *History and Antiquities of Freemasonry*, 3rd rev. ed. (1882–87; New York: Yorsten, 1951).
- Grafton, Anthony, *Cardano's Cosmos: The Worlds and Works of a Renaissance Astrologer* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1999).
- , "Close Encounters of the Learned Kind: Joseph Scaliger's Table Talk," *The American Scholar*, 57 (1988), 586–87.

- , "Protestant versus Prophet: Isaac Casaubon on Hermes Trismegistus," *JWCI*, 46 (1983), 78–90.
- , *Joseph Scaliger* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1983).
- Grape, Anders, "Comenius, Bengt Skytte och Royal Society," *Lychnos* (1936), 319–30.
- Greengrass, Mark, Michael Leslie, and Timothy Raylor, eds., *Samuel Hartlib and Universal Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994).
- Gregg, Pauline, *King Charles I* (Berkeley: California UP, 1981).
- Grell, Ole, Jonathan Israel, and Nicholas Tyacke, eds., *From Persecution to Toleration: The Glorious Revolution and Religion in England* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991).
- Gruenewald, Ithmar, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (Leiden: Brill, 1980).
- Gurney, John, "Lady Jane Berkeley, Ashley House, and Architectural Innovation in Late-Elizabethan England," *AH*, 43 (2000), 113–17.
- Gutstein, Morris, *The Story of the Jews of Newport, 1658–1908* (New York: Bloch, 1936).
- Guttmann, Joseph, ed., *No Graven Images: Studies in Art and the Hebrew Bible* (New York: Ktav, 1971).
- , ed., *The Synagogue: Studies in Origins, Archaeology, and Architecture* (New York: Ktav, 1975).
- , ed., *The Temple of Solomon: Archaeological Fact and Medieval Tradition in Christian, Islamic, and Jewish Art* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976).
- Gwynne, Robin, "James II in the Light of His Treatment of Huguenot Refugees in England, 1685–1686," *English Historical Review*, 92 (1977), 820–33.
- Hachili, Rachel, "The Niche and the Ark in Ancient Synagogues," *Bulletin of American Schools of Oriental Research*, 222 (1976), 43–50.
- Hakansson, Hakan, *Seeing the Word: John Dee and Renaissance Occultism*. Ugglan, Minervaserien 2 (Lund: Lund UP, 2001).
- Halevi, Judah, *The Kuzari*, ed. Isaak Heineman (New York: Oxford: East and West Library, 1947).
- , *The Kuzari*, ed. Henry Slonimsky (New York: Schocken, 1964).
- Hamill, John, *The Craft: a History of English Freemasonry* (London: Aquarian, 1986).
- Harington, James, *The Letters and Epigrams of Sir James Harington*, ed. N.E. McClure (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania UP, 1930).
- Harley, Edward, *An Humble Essay Toward the Settlement of Peace and Truth in the Church* (London: N. Simmons, 1681).
- , *A Scriptural and Rational Account of the Christian Religions* (London: J. Luntley, 1695).
- Harris, John, "The Architecture of the Williamite Court," in R.P. Maccubin and M. Hamilton-Phillips, eds., *The Age of William III and Mary II: Power, Politics, and Patronage* (Williamsburg: College of William and Mary, 1989), 227–33.
- , *William Talman: Maverick Architect* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1982).
- , and Stephen Orgel, Roy Strong, *The King's Arcadia: Inigo Jones and the Stuart Court* (London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1973).
- Hart, Vaughan, *Art and Magic in the Court of the Stuarts* (London: Routledge, 1994).
- , "'A Piece rather of good Heraldry, than of Architecture': Heraldry and the Orders of Architecture as Joint Emblems of Chivalry," *Res*, 23 (1993), 53–61.
- , *St. Paul's Cathedral, Sir Christopher Wren* (London: Phaidon, 1995).
- Hartley, Harold, ed., *The Royal Society: Its Origins and Founders* (London: Royal Society, 1960).
- Haveli, Zev ben Shimon, *The Way of Kabbalah* (New York: Samuel Weiser, 1976).
- Hawes, Edmund, *Annales, or, a General Chronicle of England* (London, 1615).
- Hay, George, *The Architecture of Scottish Post-Reformation Churches* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1957).
- Hay, Gilbert, *The Buik of King Alexander the Conqueror*, ed. John Cartwright (Edinburgh: Scottish Texts Society, 1986).

- , *Gilbert of the Haye's Prose Manuscript (A.D. 1456)*, ed. J.H. Stephenson (Edinburgh: Blackwood, 1901).
- , *The Prose Works of Gilbert Hay*, ed. Jonathan Glenn (Edinburgh: Scottish Text Society, 1993).
- Hay, Richard, *A Genealogie of the Saintclares of Rosslyn* (Edinburgh: T.G. Stevenson, 1835).
- Hayem, Fernand, *Le Maréchal d'Ancre et Léonora Galigai* (Paris, 1910).
- Hearne, Thomas, *Remarks and Collections of Thomas Hearne*, ed. C.E. Doble (Oxford: Clarendon, 1884–1921).
- , *Reliquiae Hearnianae*, 2nd ed., ed. Philip Bliss (London, 1869).
- Hébreu, Léon, *Dialogues d'Amour*, ed. T.A. Perry (Chapel Hill: North Carolina UP, 1974).
- Heilbron, J.L., *Physics at the Royal Society During Newton's Presidency* (Los Angeles: Clark Library, 1983).
- Heinemann, F.H., "John Toland and the Age of Enlightenment," *Review of English Studies*, 20 (1944), 127–28.
- Heisler, Ron, "The Impact of Freemasonry on Elizabethan Literature," *HJ* (1990), 52.
- , "John Evelyn and Freemasonry," *AQC*, 109 (1996), 262–632.
- , "Michael Maier in England," *HJ* (1989), 119.
- , "Phillip Ziegler—the Rosicrucian 'King of Jerusalem,'" *HJ* (1990), 3–10.
- , "Robert Fludd: A Picture in Need of Expansion," *HJ* (1989), 139–40.
- , "Rosicrucianism: the First Blooming in Britain," *HJ* (1989), 30–61.
- Henning, Basil, ed., *The House of Commons, 1660–1690* (London: History of Parliament Trust, 1983).
- Henrietta Maria, Queen, *The Letters of Queen Henrietta Maria*, ed. Mary Anne Everett Green (London: R. Bentley, 1857).
- Heydon, John, *Elhawarena* (London: William Gilbertson, 1665).
- , *The Holy Guide* (London, 1662).
- , *A New Method of Rosie-Crucian Physick* (London: Thomas Locke, 1658).
- , *Psonithonphanchia* (London: William Gilbertson, 1664).
- , *Theomagia, or the Temple of Wisdom* (London: Henry Brome, 1664).
- , *The Wise Man's Crown: or, the Glory of the Rosie-Cross* (London: Samuel Speed, 1664).
- Higgins, Ian, *Swift's Politics: A Study in Disaffection* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994).
- Hill, Christopher, *Change and Continuity in Seventeenth-century England*, rev. ed. (New Haven: Yale UP, 1991).
- , "Till the Conversion of the Jews," in Richard Popkin, ed., *Millenarianism and Messianism in English Literature and Thought, 1650–1800* (Leiden: Brill, 1988), 12–36.
- Hillgarth, J.N., *Ramon Lull and Lullism in Fourteenth-Century France* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971).
- Hills, Gordon P., "Notes on the Rainsford Papers in the British Museum," *AQC*, 26 (1913), 93–130.
- Hine, William, "Athanasius Kircher and Magnetism," in J. Fletcher, *Kircher*, 79–98.
- Hirst, Desirée, "The Bodleian Scroll: Hunt Add.E.R. (Roll): the European Background to Clement Edmondes' Gift to Sir Thomas Bodley for his New Library of a Large Illustrated Scroll of the Kabbalah," in Gunnar Sorelius and Michael Srigley, eds., *Cultural Exchange Between European Nations During the Renaissance* (Uppsala: Academiae Upsaliensis, 1994), 184–92.
- Hiscock, W.G., *John Evelyn and His Family Circle* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955).
- HMC: *Second Report* (London, 1871).
- HMC 29: *13th Report, Appendix II, The Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Portland at Welbeck Abbey* (London, 1893–94).

- HMC: *14th Report, Appendix, Part ii. Portland MSS.* (London, 1894).
- HMC: *Report on the MSS. of the Earl of Mar and Kellie Preserved at Alloa House* (London, 1904).
- Holmes, Grace, *The Order of the Garter* (Windsor: Oxley, 1984).
- Holmyard, E.J., *Alchemy* (1957; rpt. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968).
- Hooke, Robert, *The Diary of Robert Hooke*, ed. H.W. Robinson and W. Adams (London: Taylor and Francis, 1935).
- , *The Posthumous Works of Robert Hooke* (1703; facs. rpt. New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1969).
- Hopkins, P.A., "Sir James Montgomerie of Skelmorlie," in E. Corp *Stuart Court*, 51–56.
- Hotson, Howard, "Philosophical Pedagogy in Reformed Central Europe Between Ramus and Comenius: a Survey of the Continental Background of the 'Three Foreigners,'" in M. Greengrass, *Samuel Hartlib*, 45–49.
- Howard, Deborah, "The Kinnoul Aisle and Monument," *AH*, 39 (1996), 36–53.
- , *Scottish Architecture: Reformation to Restoration* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1995).
- Howarth, David, *Images of Rule: Art and Politics in the English Renaissance, 1485–1649* (London: Macmillan, 1997).
- Howell, James, *The Wonderfull, and Most Deplorable History of the Latter Times of the Jews, of the City of Jerusalem* (1652; London: J.L., 1653).
- Hubicki, Włodzimierz, "Michael Sendivogius," in C. Gillespie, *Dictionary*.
- , "The Mystery of Alexander Seton, the Cosmopolite," *Proceedings of XIV International Congress of History of Science* (Tokyo-Kyoto, 1974), 397–400.
- , "The True Life of Michael Sendivogius," *Actes du XI Congrès International d'Histoire des Sciences*, IV (Warsaw, 1965), 98–103.
- Huffman, William, *Robert Fludd and the End of the Renaissance* (London: Routledge, 1988).
- Hughan, W.J., "The Ancient Stirling Lodge," *AQC*, VI (1893), 108–12.
- Hughes, Philip E., *Lefèvre: Pioneer of Ecclesiastical Renewal in France* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984).
- Hühner, Leon, "The Jews of Ireland: an Historical Sketch," *TJHSE*, 5 (1902–05), 226–38.
- Hunter, Michael, *Establishing the New Science: The Experience of the Early Royal Society* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1989).
- , *John Aubrey and the Realm of Learning* (London: Duckworth, 1975).
- , *Science and the Shape of Orthodoxy* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1995).
- , and Simon Schaffer, eds., *Robert Hooke: New Studies* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1989).
- Huntley, Frank, *Bishop Joseph Hall, 1574–1656* (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1979).
- Hutchinson, Francis E., *Henry Vaughan: A Life and Interpretation* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1947).
- Hutton, Ronald, *Charles II* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1989).
- Huygens, Christiaan, *Oeuvres Complètes* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1888–1950).
- Huygens, Constantijn, *Die Briefwisseling, 1608–1687*, ed. J.A. Worp (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1911–18).
- Idel, Moshe, *Kabbalah: New Perspectives* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1988).
- , *The Mystical Experience in Abraham Abulafia*, trans. Jonathan Chipman (Albany: State University of New York, 1988).
- , "The Origin of Alchemy According to Zozimos and a Hebrew Parallel," *Revue des Études Juives*, 145 (1986), 117–24.
- , "The Reification of Language," in Steven Katz, ed., *Mysticism and Language* (New York: Oxford UP, 1992), 42–79.
- , "Ramon Lull and Ecstatic Kabbalah," *JWCI*, 51 (1988), 170–74.

- Isenberg, Sheldon, "Power Through Temple and Torah in Greco-Roman Palestine," in Jacob Neusner, ed. *Christianity, Judaism, and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith* (London: E.J. Brill, 1975), 24–45.
- Israel, Jonathan, *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991).
- Jacob, Margaret, *Living the Enlightenment: Freemasonry and Politics in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (New York: Oxford UP, 1991).
- , *The Radical Enlightenment: Pantheists, Freemasons, and Republicans* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1981).
- James V, *The Letters of James V*, ed. Denis Hay (Edinburgh: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1954).
- James VI and I, *The Basilikon Doron of King James VI*, ed. James Craigie (Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1944).
- , *Minor Prose Works of James VI and I*, eds. James Craigie and Alexander Law (Edinburgh: Scottish Texts Society, 1982).
- , *New Poems of James I of England*, ed. Allan Westcott (New York: AMS, 1966).
- , *The Poems of James VI of Scotland*, ed. James Craigie (Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1955).
- , *The Political Works of James I*, ed. Charles McIlwain (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1918).
- , *The Workes of James, King of Great Britaine, France, and Ireland* (London: Robert Barker and John Bell, 1616).
- Jamieson, Ted, *George Monck and the Restoration* (Fort Worth: Texas Christian UP, 1975).
- Jayne, Sears and Francis Johnson, eds., *The Lumley Library: The Catalogue of 1609* (London: British Museum, 1956).
- Jeffery, Paul, *The City Churches of Christopher Wren* (London: Hambledon, 1996).
- , *The Jews in Medieval York* (York: York Minster Education Department, 1998).
- Johnson, A.W., *Ben Jonson: Poetry and Architecture* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994).
- Jones, George H., *Charles Middleton: The Life and Times of a Restoration Politician* (Chicago: Chicago UP, 1967).
- Jonson, Ben, *Ben Jonson*, eds. C.H. Herford and Percy Simpson (Oxford: Clarendon, 1925–63).
- Josephs, Zoe, "Jewish Glass Makers," *TJHSE*, 24 (1970–73), 107–19.
- Josephus, Flavius, *The Life and Works of Flavius Josephus*, trans. William Whiston (1737; Philadelphia: John Winston, 1957).
- Josten, C.H., *Elias Ashmole (1617–1692)* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1966).
- , "Robert Fludd's 'Philosophical Key' and His Alchemical Experiment Upon Wheat," *Ambix*, 11 (1963), 1–23.
- , "Truth's Golden Harrow," *Ambix*, 3 (1949), 91–152.
- , "William Backhouse of Swallowfield," *Ambix*, 4 (1949), 1–34.
- Kahler, Lisa, "Freemasonry in Edinburgh, 1721–46: Institutions and Context," St. Andrews University, Ph.D. Thesis, 1998.
- Kahn, David, *The Codebreakers: The Story of Secret Writing* (New York: Macmillan, 1967).
- Kaplan, Aryeh, *Jewish Meditation: A Practical Guide* (New York: Schocken, 1985).
- Kaplan, Yosef, Henry Méchoulán, and Richard Popkin, eds., *Menasseh ben Israel and His World* (Leiden: Brill, 1989).
- Katz, David S., "The Abendana Brothers and the Christian Hebraists of Seventeenth-Century England," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 40 (1989), 28–52.
- , *The Jews in the History of England* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1994).
- , "The Jews of England and 1688," in O. Grell, *From Persecution*, 217–49.
- , "Menasseh ben Israel's Mission to Queen Christina of Sweden," *Jewish Social Studies*, 45 (1983), 57–71.
- , *Philo-Semitism and the Readmission of the Jews to England, 1603–1655* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982).

- , *Sabbath and Sectarianism in Seventeenth-century England* (Leiden: Brill, 1988).
- Katz, Jacob, *Jews and Freemasons in Europe, 1723–1939* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1970).
- Keith, William, "John Webb and the Court Theatre of Charles II," *Architectural Review*, 57 (1925), 49–55.
- Kernan, Alvin, *Shakespeare, the King's Playwright* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1995).
- Kerr, Robert, *Correspondance of Sir Robert Kerr, First Earl of Ancrum, and His Son, William, Third Earl of Lothian*, ed. David Laing. Roxburghe Club Publications, 100 (Edinburgh, 1875).
- Keynes, Geoffrey, *John Evelyn: A Study in Bibliography with a Bibliography of His Writings* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968).
- Kidd, Colin, *Subverting Scotland's Past* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997).
- "The Kincardine Papers, 1649–1679," *The Spottiswoode Miscellany* (Edinburgh: Spottiswoode Society, 1845), II, 211ff.
- King, E.J., *The Grand Priory of the Order of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem in England* (London: St. John's Gate, 1924).
- Kircher, Athanasius, *Oedipus Aegyptiacus* (Romae, 1652–54).
- Kirk, Robert, *The Secret Commonwealthe and a Short Treatise on Charms and Spells (1691)*, ed. Stewart Sanderson (Totoway: Roman and Littlefield, 1976).
- Knoop, Douglas and G.P. Jones, *Early Masonic Pamphlets* (London: Q.C. Correspondence Circle, 1978).
- , *The Genesis of Freemasonry* (London: Quatuor Coronati Lodge, 1978).
- , "The London Mason in the Seventeenth Century," *AQC*, 5–100.
- , *The Scottish Mason and the Mason Word* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1939).
- , *The Two Earliest Masonic MSS.* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1938).
- Knowles, W.E., ed., *Lorenzo Magalotti at the Court of Charles II: His "Relazione d'Inghilterre" of 1668* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier, 1980).
- Knox, John, *John Knox's History of the Reformation in Scotland*, ed. W.C. Dickinson (New York: Philosophical Library, 1950).
- Krinsky, Carol, "Representations of the Temple of Jerusalem before 1500," *JWCI*, 33 (1970), 1–19.
- Kuntz, Marion, *Guillaume Postel* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1981).
- Lachower, Fischel and Isaiah Tishby, eds., *The Wisdom of the Zohar*, trans. David Goldstein (New York: Oxford UP, 1989).
- Lake, Peter and Kevin Sharpe, *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England* (London: Macmillan, 1994).
- Lambi, J.B., *A Revelation of the Secret Spirit*, trans. R.N.E. [Robert Napier] (London: John Haviland, 1623).
- Landa, Louis, *Swift and the Church of Ireland* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1954).
- Landsberger, Franz, *A History of Jewish Art* (Cincinnati: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1946).
- Lane, Jane, *Titus Oates* (London: Andrew Dakers, 1949).
- Lang, Andrew, *Sir George Mackenzie* (London: Longmans, Green, 1909).
- Larkin, James and Paugh Hughes, eds., *Stuart Royal Proclamations* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1973).
- Laud, William, *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God, William Laud, D.D.*, ed. William Scott (Oxford: John Parker, 1847).
- Lauderdale, John Maitland, Duke of, *Bibliotheca Selectissima* (London, 1687).
- Lawrie, Alexander, *The History of Freemasonry* (Edinburgh: Alexander Lawrie, 1804).
- Lawson, John, *The Life and Times of William Laud* (London: Rivington, 1929).
- Lee, Maurice, *Government by Pen: Scotland Under James VI and I* (Urbana: Illinois UP, 1980).
- , *Great Britain's Solomon: James VI and I in His Three Kingdoms* (Urbana: Illinois UP, 1990).

- , *The Road to Revolution: Scotland Under Charles I, 1625–1637* (Chicago: Chicago UP, 1985).
- Lefavre, Liane, *Leon Battista Alberti's Hypnerotomachia Poliphili* (Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1997).
- Le Forestier, René, *La Franc-Maçonnerie Templière et Occultiste aux XVIII^e et XIX^e Siècles*, ed. Antoine Faivre (Paris: Louvain, 1970).
- Legge, M. Dominica, "La Pierre d'Ecosse," *SHR*, 38 (1959), 109–13.
- Leon, Jacob Jehudah, *Alabancas de Santidad* (Amsterdam, 1671).
- , *Jacobi Jehuda leonis de Templo Hierosolymitano . . . ex Ebraeo Latine Recensiti à Johanne Sauberto* (Helmstadt: Jacob Mullerus, 1665).
- Léon-Jones, Karen Silvia de, *Giordano Bruno and the Kabbalah: Prophets, Magicians, and Rabbis* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1997).
- Lepper, John Heron, *The Differences Between English and Irish Masonic Rituals Treated Historically* (Dublin: George Healy, 1920).
- , "The Poor Common Soldier," a Study of Irish Ambulatory Warrants," *AQC*, 38 (1925), 149–55.
- , and Philip Crossle, *History of the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of Ireland* (Dublin: Lodge of Research, 1925).
- Lesser, George, *Gothic Cathedrals and Sacred Geometry* (London: Alec Tiranti, 1957).
- Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim, *Lessing's Masonic Dialogues*, trans. A. Cohen (London: Baskerville, 1927).
- Levy, Arthur, "The Origins of Scottish Jewry," *TJHSE*, 20 (1959–61), 129–62.
- Levy, Raphael, *The Beginnings of Wisdom: An Astrological Treatise by Abraham Ibn Ezra* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1939).
- Lieberman, Saul, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1956).
- Lilly, William, *The Last of the Astrologers: Mr. William Lilly's History of His Life and Times*, ed. Katherine Briggs (1715; rpt. Ilkley: Scolar Press, 1974).
- Linden, Stanton, "Arthur Dee and Johannes Bánfi Hunyades: Further Information on their Alchemical and Professional Activities," *Ambix*, 24 (1977), 98–99.
- , "Jonson and Sendivogius: Some New Light on Mercury Vindicated from the Alchemists at Court," *Ambix*, 24 (1977), 38–54.
- Lindsay, Lord Alexander W.C., *Lives of the Lindsays* (Wigan: C.S. Simms, 1840).
- Lindsay, Robert, *A History of the Mason Lodge of Holyrood House (St. Luke's), Number 44* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1935).
- Lindsay of Pittscottie, Robert, *The History of Scotland*, 3rd ed. (1728; Edinburgh, 1778).
- Linklater, Magnus and Christian Hesketh, *For King and Country: John Graham of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee, 1648–1689* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1989).
- Little, Bryan, *Sir Christopher Wren: A Historical Biography* (London: Robert Hale, 1979).
- Locke, John, *Correspondence of John Locke*, ed. E.S. de Beer (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976).
- Lockyer, Roger, *Buckingham: The Life and Political Career of George Villiers, First Duke of Buckingham, 1592–1628* (London: Longmans, 1981).
- , *James VI and I* (London: Longman's, 1998).
- Loeber, Rolf, *A Biographical Dictionary of Architects in Ireland, 1620–1720* (London: John Murray, 1981).
- , "Early Classicism in Ireland before the Georgian Era," *AH*, 22 (1979), 49–63.
- Loker, Zvi, "Juan de Yllan, Merchant Adventurer and Colonial Promoter: New Evidence," *Studia Rosenthaliana*, 17 (1983), 22–24.
- Louw, H.J., "Anglo-Netherlandish Architectural Exchange, c. 1600–c.1660," *AH*, 24 (1981), 14–23.
- Lownes, H.?, *A Supplication of the Family of Love* (Cambridge: John Legate, 1606).
- Lull, Ramon, *Selected Works of Ramon Llull*, trans. Anthony Bonner (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1985).

- Luynes, Duc de, *Memoires du Duc de Luynes sur la Cour de Louis XV* (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1860).
- Lydgate, John, *Lydgate's Temple of Glas*, ed. J. Schick (London: Humphrey Milford, 1924).
- , *Lydgate's Troy Book*, ed. Henry Bergen (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, and Trübner, 1906).
- Lynch, Michael, ed., *Mary Stewart, Queen in Three Kingdoms* (Oxford: Blackwell's, 1988).
- , "A Nation Born Again? Scottish Identity in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," in D. Broun, *Image and Identity*, 82–104.
- Lyon, David Murray, *History of the Lodge of Edinburgh, Mary's Chapel, No. 1, Embracing an Account of the Rise and Progress of Freemasonry in Scotland*, 2nd ed. (London: Gresham, 1900).
- , "The Royal Order of Scotland," *The Freemason* (4 September 1880), 393.
- Macauley, James, *The Classical Country House in Scotland, 1660–1800* (London: Faber and Faber, 1987).
- , "The Seventeenth-century Genesis of Hamilton Palace," in John Frew and David Jones, eds., *Aspects of Scottish Classicism* (St. Andrews: St. Andrews UP, 1988), 17–24.
- MacDonald, Colin, "The Struggle of George Dundas and His Rival Patric Panter, James Cortesius, and Alexander Stewart for the Preceptory of Torpichen," *SHR*, 14 (1917).
- Macdonald, Robert, *The Library of William Drummond of Hawthornden* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1971).
- Macdougall, Norman, *James IV* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1989).
- Macfarlane, Leslie, *William Elphinstone and the Kingdom of Scotland, 1431–1514* (Aberdeen: Aberdeen UP, 1985).
- Macgibbon, Donald and Thomas Ross, *The Castellated and Domestic Architecture of Scotland* (Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1997).
- Macgregor, Geddes, *A Literary History of the Bible* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1968).
- Macinnes, Allan, *Charles I and the Making of the Covenanting Movement, 1625–1641* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1991).
- Mackenzie, George, *The Lives and Characters of the Most Eminent Writers of the Scots Nation* (Edinburgh: William Adams, 1708–22).
- Mackenzie, Sir George, *The Science of Heraldry* (Edinburgh: Anderson, 1680).
- Mackenzie, Kenneth, *The Royal Masonic Cyclopaedia*, ed. Robert Gilbert and John Hamill (1877; Wellingborough: Aquarian, 1987).
- Mackenzie, W.C., *The Life and Times of John Maitland, Duke of Lauderdale (1616–1682)* (London: Kegan Paul, 1929).
- Mackenzie, William, *The Medieval Castle in Scotland* (New York: Blom, 1972).
- MacKechie, Aonghus, "Evidence of a Post-1603 Court Architecture in Scotland," *AH*, 31 (1988), 107–18.
- , "James VI's Architects and their Architecture," in J. Goodare, *Reign of James VI*, 154–69.
- Mackey, Albert, *A Lexicon of Freemasonry*, 3rd rev. ed. (1845; Philadelphia: Moss, 1858).
- Mackie, Robert, *King James IV of Scotland* (Edinburgh: Tweeddale Court, 1958).
- Maclean, James, "Montrose's Preparations for the Invasion of Scotland, and Royalist Missions to Sweden, 1649–1651," in Ragnhild Hatton and M.S. Anderson, eds., *Studies in Diplomatic History* (London: Longman's, 1970), 7–30.
- Maidment, James, *Historical Fragments, Relative to Scottish Affairs, from 1635 to 1664* (Edinburgh: Thomas Stevenson, 1833).
- Maier, Michael, *Themis Aurea. The Laws of the Fraternity of the Rosie Crosse* (London: N. Brooke, 1656).

- Maitland, Richard and Alexander, Lord Kingston, *The History of the House of Seytoun*, Bannatyne and Maitland Clubs (Edinburgh, 1829).
- Mâle, Emile, *The Gothic Image: Religious Art in France of the Thirteenth Century*, trans. Dorra Nussey (New York: Harper and Row, 1958).
- Manzaloui, M.A., "Philip of Tripoli and his Textual Methods," in W. Ryan, *Pseudo-Aristotle*, 55–72.
- McQuarrie, Alan, *Scotland and the Crusades, 1095–1560* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1985).
- Marceline, George, *The Triumphs of King James the First* (London: John Budge, 1610).
- Marci, Marcus, *Idearum Operaticum* (Prague, 1635).
- , *Liburgia Mentis seu Disceptatio Medica, Philosophica, et Optica*, ed. Jacobus Dobrzinsky (Ratisbone, 1678).
- , *Ortho-Sophia*, ed. Jacobus Dobrzinsky (Prague, 1682).
- Marcus, Ralph, *Philo: Supplement. Questions and Answers on Genesis and Exodus* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1928).
- Marquet, Y., "Ikhwan al-Safa," *Encyclopedia of Islam*, rev. ed. (London: Luzac, 1971), 1071–76.
- Marrafioto, Hieronymo, *Ars Memoriae* (Frankfurt, 1602–03).
- Marsh, Christopher, *The Family of Love in England, 1550–1630* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994).
- Marshall, Rosalind, *Mary of Guise* (London: Collins, 1977).
- Marshall, Thomas, *The History of Perth* (Perth: J. Fisher, 1840).
- Martin, D.C., "Sir Robert Moray, FRS," in H. Hartley, *Royal Society*, 239–50.
- Marvell, Andrew, *The Rehearsal Transpros'd*, ed. D.I.B. Smith (1673; Oxford: Clarendon, 1971).
- Mason, Roger, "Scotching the Brut: Politics, History, and National Myth in Sixteenth-Century Scotland," in R. Mason, *Scotland and England*, 60–84.
- , ed., *Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994).
- Masson, David, *Drummond of Hawthornden* (London: Macmillan, 1873).
- Mathew, David, *James I* (Tuscaloosa: Alabama UP, 1968).
- Mathews, William, "The Egyptians in Scotland: The Political History of a Myth," *Viator* (1970), 289–306.
- Matthey, Ignaz, "De Beteknis van de Naturen," in Hans Bot, ed., *Constantijn Huygens: Zijn Plaats in Geleerd Europa* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam UP, 1973).
- Maxwell, James, *Admirable and Notable Prophecies, Uttered in Former Times by Twenty-four Famous Roman Catholics*, 2nd ed. (1614; London: Alde, 1615).
- , *The Golden Art* (London: William Leake, 1611).
- , *The Golden Legend* (London: E. White, 1611).
- , *A Monument of Remembrance* (London: Nicholas Oker, 1613).
- , *A New Eight-Fold Probation of the Church of England's Divine Constitution* (London: Legatt, 1617).
- Maxwell, William, *De Medicina Magnetica*, ed. Georgio Franco (Frankfurt: J.B. Zubradt, 1679).
- Maxwell-Stuart, P.G., "De Verbo Mirifico: Johannes Reuchlin and the Royal Arch," *AQC*, 99 (1986), 206–09.
- Mayhew, George, "Swift and the Tripos Tradition," *Philological Quarterly*, 45 (1966), 85–101.
- McCrindle, J.W., ed., *The Christian Topography of Cosmas, an Egyptian Monk* (1897; rpt. New York: Burt Franklin, 1964).
- McEvoy, James, "Biblical and Platonic Measure in John Scottus Erigena," in Bernard McGinn and Willemien Otten, eds., *Erigena: East and West* (Notre Dame: Notre Dame UP, 1977), 453–62.
- McGrail, Thomas, *Sir William Alexander, First Earl of Stirling* (Edinburgh: Olivier and Boyd, 1940).

- McKean, Charles, "Hamilton of Finnart," *History Today* (January 1993), 42–47.
- , "Sir James Hamilton of Finnart: a Renaissance Courtier-Architect," *AH*, 42 (1999), 141–68.
- McLean, Adam, "Alchemy in Scotland—a 17th Century Text," *HJ*, 2 (1978), 40–44.
- , *A Compendium of the Rosicrucian Vault*. Hermetic Research Series No. 4 (Edinburgh, 1985).
- , "The Manuscript Sources of the English Translations of the Rosicrucian Manifestoes," paper presented at Conference on "Rosenkreuz als Europäische Phänomen im 17. Jahrhundert," at Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel (1994).
- , "Müller's Process," *HJ*, 12 (1989), 27–33.
- , "A Rosicrucian Manuscript of Michael Maier," *HJ*, 5 (1979), 5–7.
- , "A Rosicrucian/Alchemical Mystery Centre in Scotland," *HJ*, 4 (1979), 11–13.
- McLeod, Wallace, "Additions to the List of Old Charges," *AQC*, 96 (1893), 98–108.
- , "The Hudibrastick Poem of 1723," *AQC*, 107 (1994), 13–20.
- McLynn, Frank, *Charles Edward Stuart* (1988; Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991).
- McPherson, David, "Ben Jonson's Library and Marginalia," *Studies in Philology*, 71 (1974), x–97.
- Mebane, John, *Renaissance Magic and the Return of the Golden Age* (Lincoln: Nebraska UP, 1989).
- Melville, James, *The Diary of Mr. James Melville, 1556–1601* (Edinburgh: Bannatyne Club, 1839).
- Melville, Sir James, *The Memoirs of Sir James Melville*, ed. A. Francis Steuart (London: Routledge, 1929).
- Mendelsohn, I., "Guilds in Ancient Palestine," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, 80 (1940), 17–21.
- Mendelsohn, J. Andrew, "Alchemy and Politics in England, 1649–1665," *Past and Present*, 185 (1992), 30–78.
- Merkur, Dan, *Gnosis: An Esoteric Tradition of Mystical Visions and Unions* (Albany: State University of New York, 1993).
- Merzdorf, Br., "Geschichte der Freimaurerbrüderschaft in Schweden und Norwegen," *Latomia*, 7 (1846), 175.
- , "Über die Grundverfassung der Grossen Landeslogen von Schweden dd. 1800," *Latomia*, 24 (1873), 29.
- Mexia, Pedro, *Syba de Varia Lección* (Valldolid, 1550–55).
- Milton, Anthony, "'The Unchanged Peacemaker'? John Dury and the Politics of Irenicism in England, 1628–1643," in M. Greengrass, *Samuel Hartlib*, 95–117.
- Milton, John, *The Works of John Milton*, ed. F.A. Patterson (New York: Columbia UP, 1932).
- Mitchell, David, *The Jesuits: A History* (London: Macdonald, 1980).
- Monod, Paul, *Jacobitism and the English People, 1688–1788* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989).
- Montgomery, John Warwick, *Cross and Crucible: Johann Valentin Andreae (1586–1654)* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973).
- Moran, Bruce, *The Alchemical World of the German Court: Occult Philosophy and Chemical Medicine in the Circle of Moritz of Hessen, 1572–1632* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1991).
- Morbach, Phillipe, "Les régiments écossais et irlandais à St. Germain-en-Laye: myth ou réalité maçonnique?" in Edward Corp, ed., *L'autre exil: Les Jacobites en France au début de XVIII-siècle* (Montpellier, 1993), 143–55.
- Morestel, *Artis Kabbalisticae, sive Sapientiae Divinae Academia* (Paris, 1621).
- Moss, Jean Dietz, "Goddess with God": *Hendrik Niclaes and His Family of Love* (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1981).

- Mothus, Alain and Charles Porset, "A Propos du Secret des Francs-Maçons: une référence Jacobite (1705)?" in Charles Porset, ed., *Studia Latomorum et Historica: Mélanges offerts à Daniel Ligou* (Paris: Slatkine, 1998), 327–33.
- Mulryne, J.R. and Margaret Shewring, eds., *Theatre and Government Under the Early Stuarts* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993).
- Munck, Solomon, *Mélanges Philosophiques Juives et Arabes*, nouv. ed. (1857; Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1955).
- Murphy, Sean, "Irish Jacobitism and Freemasonry," *Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, 9 (1994), 84.
- Murr, Christophe G., *Über den wahren Ursprung der Rosenkreutzer und des Freymaurerordens* (Sulzbach: J.E. Seidel, 1803).
- Mylne, Robert S., *The Master Masons to the Crown of Scotland and Their Works* (Edinburgh: Scot, Ferguson, and Burness, 1893).
- Napier, John, *A Plaine Discovery of the Whole Revelation of St. John*, 5th ed. (1593; Edinburgh: Andrew Wilson, 1645).
- Napier, Mark, *Memoirs of John Napier of Merchiston* (Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1834).
- Nethercot, Arthur, *Abraham Cowley* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1931).
- Nettelbladt, C.C.F.W., *Geschichte Freimaurerische Systeme in England, Frankreich, und Deutschland* (1879; facs. rpt. Wiesbaden, 1972).
- Neusner, Jacob, *A History of the Jews in Babylonia* (Leiden: Brill, 1966).
- Newman, J., "Inigo Jones and the Politics of Architecture," in P. Lake, *Culture and Politics*, 229–55.
- Newman, Louis, *Jewish Influence on Christian Reform Movements* (1925; rpt. New York: AMS, 1966).
- Newman, William, *Gehennical Fire: The Lives of George Starkey, an American Alchemist in the Scientific Revolution* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1994).
- Newton, Joseph Fort, *The Builders: A Story and Study of Masonry* (1914; rpt. New York: Doran, 1924).
- Nicholas, Edward, *The Nicholas Papers*, ed. George Warner (London: Camden Society, 1892).
- Nicholas, N.H., *The Statutes of the Order of the Thistle* (London: William Pickering, 1828).
- Nicholson, Helen, *Templars, Hospitallers, and Teutonic Knights: the Image of the Military Orders, 1128–1291* (Leicester: Leicester UP, 1993).
- Nisbet, Alexander, *A System of Heraldry, Speculative and Practical* (Edinburgh: J. Mackuen, 1722).
- Nordmann, Claude, *Gustave III: Un Démocrate Couronné* (Lille: Presses Universitaires, 1986).
- Nordström, Carl-Otto, "The Temple Miniatures in the Peter Comestos Manuscripts at Madrid," in J. Guttmann, *No Graven Images*, 39–81.
- Novy, Lubos, "Johannes Marcus Marci of Kronland," in C. Gillespie, *Dictionary*, IX, 96–98.
- Nylander, K.U., "Semitiska studier i Sverige under flydda tider," *Ny Svensk Tidskrift*, 10 (1889), 194–99.
- Oates, Titus, *A True Narrative of the Horrid Plot and Conspiracy of the Popish Party* (Dublin, 1679).
- Offenberg, A.K., "Jacob Jehudah Leon (1602–1675) and His Model of the Temple," in J. Van den Berg, *Jewish Christian Relations*, 95–115.
- Ogilby, John, *The Entertainment of His Most Excellent Majesty Charles II*, ed. Ronald Knowles (Binghamton: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1988).
- Oldenburg, Henry, *The Correspondence of Henry Oldenburg*, eds. A.R. and M.B. Hall (Madison: Wisconsin UP, 1973).
- O'Niell, John, *George Villiers, Second Duke of Buckingham* (Boston: Twayne Authors, 1984).

- Oppenheim, Samuel, *The Jews and Masonry in the United States before 1810*. Reprint from *Publications of American Jewish Historical Society*, 19 (1910).
- Ore, Oystein, *Cardano: The Gambling Scholar* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1953).
- Orgel, Stephen, *The Illusion of Power: Political Theatre in the English Renaissance* (Berkeley: California UP, 1975).
- , and Roy Strong, *Inigo Jones: The Theatre of the Stuart Court* (Los Angeles: California UP, 1973).
- Orrery, Roger Boyle, Earl of, *The Dramatic Works of Roger Boyle, Earl of Orrery*, ed. W.S. Clark (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1937).
- Osborne, Frances, *Traditional Memoires of the Raigne of James the First (1658)*; reprint in W. Scott, *Secret History*, I.
- Otway, Thomas, *The Works of Thomas Otway*, ed. J.C. Ghosh (Oxford: Clarendon, 1932).
- Ouston, Hugh, "York in Edinburgh: James VII and the Patronage of Learning in Scotland, 1679–1688," in John Dwyer, Roger Mason, and Alexander Murdoch, eds., *New Perspectives on the Politics and Culture of Early Modern Scotland* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1983), 133–55.
- Palaye, St., *Memoirs of Ancient Chivalry* (London: J. Dodsley, 1784).
- Palissy, Bernard, *Oeuvres de Bernard Palissy*, eds. M. Faujas de Saint-Fond and M. Gobet (Paris: Ruault, 1777).
- Palme, Per, *Triumph of Peace: A Study of the Whitehall Banqueting House* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1957).
- Papers Relative to the Royal Guard of Scottish Archers in France* (Edinburgh: Maitland Club, 1835).
- Parker, Samuel, *A Free and Impartial Censure of the Platonick Philosophie* (Oxford: W. Hall, 1666).
- Parry, Graham, *The Golden Age Restor'd: The Culture of the Stuart Court, 1603–1642* (New York: St. Martin's, 1983).
- Partner, Peter, *The Murdered Magicians: The Templars and Their Myth* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1982).
- Pasmore, Stephen, "Thomas Henshaw, FRS (1618–1700)," *Notes and Records of Royal Society*, 36 (1982), 377–80.
- Patai, Raphael, *The Hebrew Goddess* (New York: Ktav, 1967).
- , *The Jewish Alchemists* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994).
- , *Man and Temple in Ancient Jewish Myth and Ritual*, 2nd rev. ed. (New York: Ktav, 1967).
- , "Maria the Jewess—Founding Mother of Alchemy," *Ambix*, 29 (1982), 171–93.
- Paton, Henry, *Accounts of the Masters of Works* (Edinburgh: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1957).
- "Letters from John, Second Earl of Lauderdale, to John, Second Earl of Tweeddale, and Others," *Miscellany of Scottish Historical Society*, 6 (1939), 125–238.
- Patterson, R.F., ed., *Ben Jonson's Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden* (New York: Haskell House, 1974).
- Pattison, Mark, *Isaac Casaubon, 1559–1614* (London: Longmans, Green, 1875).
- Paul, James, ed., *Compota Thesauriorum Regum Scotorum: Accounts of the Lord High Treasurer of Scotland* (Edinburgh: General Register House, 1900).
- , *The Scots Peerage* (Edinburgh: David Douglas, 1908).
- Peers, E. Allison, *Ramon Lull: A Biography* (London: SPCK, 1929).
- Pepys, Samuel, *The Diary of Samuel Pepys*, eds. Robert Latham and William Matthews (Berkeley: California UP, 1970–83).
- Perdiguier, Agricole, *Le Livre du Compagnonnage* (Paris, 1841).
- Pereira, Michael, *The Alchemical Corpus Attributed to Raymond Lull* (London: Warburg Institute, 1989).
- , "Medicina in the Alchemical Writings Attributed to Raimund Lull (14th–17th

- Centuries," in Piyo Rattansi and Antonio Clericuzio, eds., *Alchemy and Chemistry in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1994), 1–15.
- Perkins, Clarence, "The Knights Templars in the British Isles," *English Historical Review*, 25 (1910), 209–30.
- Perrot, George, and Charles Chipiez, *History of Art in Phoenecia*, trans. Walter Armstrong (London: Chapman and Hall, 1885).
- Perry, T. Anthony, *Erotic Spirituality: The Integrative Tradition from Leone Hebreo to John Donne* (Tuscaloosa: Alabama UP, 1980).
- Peters, F.E., *Aristotle and the Arabs* (New York: New York UP, 1968).
- Peterson, R.T., *Sir Kenelm Digby* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1956).
- Peyton, Edward, *The Divine Catastrophe of the Kingly Family of the House of Stuarts* (1652); reprinted in W. Scott, *Secret History*.
- Philo Judaeus, *The Works of Philo Judaeus*, ed. C.D. Yonge (London: H.G. Bohn, 1855).
- , *Philo: Supplement. Questions and Answers on Genesis and Exodus*, trans. Ralph Marcus (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1928).
- Philo-Roskelynsis, *An Account of the Chapel of Roslin* (Edinburgh, 1774).
- Phipps, Christine, *Buckingham: Public and Private Man* (New York: Garland, 1985).
- Picciotto, James, *Sketches of Anglo-Jewish History*, rev. ed., ed. Israel Finestine (1875; London: Soncino, 1956).
- Pines, Schlomo, "Scholasticism After Thomas Aquinas and the Teachings of Hasdai Crescas and His Predecessors," *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities*, 1 (1967), 3–50.
- , *Studies in the History of Jewish Thought*, eds. W.Z. Harvey and Moshe Idel (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1997).
- Platt, Sir Hugh, *The Jewell House of Art and Nature* (London: Peter Short, 1594).
- Plot, Robert, *The Natural History of Oxfordshire* (Oxford: The Theatre, 1677).
- , *The Natural History of Staffordshire* (Oxford: The Theatre, 1686).
- Popkin, Richard, "The End of the Career of a Great 17th Century Millenarian: John Dury," *Pietismus und Neuzeit*, 14 (1988), 203–20.
- , "The First College of Jewish Studies," *Revue des Études Juives*, 143 (1984), 351–64.
- , "Menasseh ben Israel and Isaac La Pyrèrè. II," *Studia Rosenthalia*, 18 (1984), 13–14.
- , "Some Aspects of Jewish-Christian Theological Interchange in Holland and England, 1640–1700," in J. Van den Berg, *Jewish-Christian Relations*, 3–32.
- , "Two Treasures of Marsh's Library," in A. Coudert, *Judaeo-Christian Intellectual Culture*, 1–12.
- Portal, Ethel, "The Academ Roial of King James I," *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 7 (1915–16), 189–208.
- Potter, Lois, *Secret Rites and Secret Writing: Royalist Literature, 1641–1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989).
- Powell, Thomas, *Quadriga Saluta* (London: Sarah Griffin, 1657).
- Pragg, J.A. Van, "Jacob Judá León Templo y Guillermo II, Principe de Orange," *Clavileño*, 41 (1956), 9–10.
- Pring-Mill, F.D., "Ramon Lull," in C. Gillespie, *Dictionary*, VIII, 547–51.
- Prinke, Rafael, "Michael Sendivogius and Christian Rosenkreutz," *HJ* (1990), 92–94.
- Purver, Marjorie, *The Royal Society: Concept and Creation* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967).
- Prynne, William, *The Time-serving Proteus, and Ambidexter Divine, Uncased to the World* (London, 1650).
- , *Canterburies Doome* (London: John Macock, 1646).

- Quinn, Dorothy, "The Career of John Gordon, Dean of Salisbury, 1603-1619," *The Historian*, 6 (1943), 76-96.
- Ramesey [Ramsay], William, *Astrologia Restaurata* (London: Robert White, 1653).
- , *De Venenis: or, A Discourse of Poysons* (London: Samuel Speed, 1663).
- Ramsay, Andrew Michael, *The Travels of Cyrus* (1730; rpt. Albany: Pratt and Doubleday, 1814).
- Ranum, Orest, *The Fronde: A French Revolution, 1648-1652* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1993).
- Rathborne, Aaron, *The Surveyor* (London: W. Stansby, 1616).
- Raylor, Timothy, *Cavaliers, Clubs, and Literary Culture: Sir John Mennes, James Smith, and the Order of the Fancy* (Newark: Delaware UP, 1994).
- Read, John, *Humour and Humanism in Chemistry* (London: G. Bell, 1947).
- , *Prelude to Chemistry* (New York: Macmillan, 1937).
- , "Scottish Alchemy in the Seventeenth Century," *Chymia*, 1 (1948), 139-51.
- , "Sketches of Early Scottish Alchemists," *Proceedings of Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, 11 (1874-76), 179-97.
- , "William Davidson of Aberdeen, the First British Professor of Chemistry," *Ambix*, 11 (1963), 70-101.
- Rees, Joan, *Samuel Daniel* (Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 1964).
- Register of the Privy Council of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1887-1908).
- Rekers, B., *Benito Arias Montano (1527-1598)* (London: Warburg Institute, 1972).
- Renaudet, Augustin, *Préréforme et Humanisme à Paris*, 2^{ème} ed. (Paris: Librairie d'Argences, 1953).
- Retz, Cardinal du, *Mémoires*, ed. Aimé Champollion-Figeac (Paris, Charpentier, 1873).
- Reuchlin, Johann, *Johann Reuchlin: On the Art of the Kabbalah*, trans. M. and S. Goodman, introd. G. Lloyd Jones (New York: Abaris, 1983).
- Rice, Eugene, "The *De Magia Naturalis* of Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples," in E.P. Mahony, ed., *Philosophy and Humanism: Essays in Honor of Paul Oskar Kristeller* (New York: Columbia UP, 1976), 19-29.
- Richelieu et le Monde de l'Esprit*. Exhibition à Université de Paris en Sorbonne (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1985).
- Riley, J.C., "Catholicism and the Late Stuart Army: the Tangier Episode," *Royal Stuart Papers XLIII* (Huntington: Royal Stuart Society, 1993).
- Roberts, John Morris, *The Mythology of the Secret Societies* (1972; Frogmore: Paladin, 1974).
- Roberts, Michael, *Gustavus Adolphus* (London: Longmans, Green, 1953).
- Robertson, Alexander, *The Life of Sir Robert Moray* (London: Longmans, Green, 1922).
- Robertson, J., *Inventaires de la Royne Descosse Douairiere de France* (Edinburgh: Scottish Texts Society, 1863).
- Robison, John, *Proofs of a Conspiracy Against All the Religions and Governments of Europe, Carried on in the Secret Meetings of Freemasons, Illuminati, and Reading Societies*, 3rd rev. ed. (1797; Philadelphia: T. Dobson, 1798).
- Rogers, Charles, *Memorials of the Earl of Stirling and of the House of Alexander* (Edinburgh: William Paterson, 1877).
- Roper, Alan, *Dryden's Poetic Kingdoms* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965).
- Rosenau, Helen, *Vision of the Temple: The Image of the Temple of Jerusalem in Judaism and Christianity* (London: Oresko, 1979).
- Rosenblatt, Samuel, *Saadia Gayon: The Book of Belief and Opinions* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1948).
- Rosenroth, Knorr von, *The Kabbalah Unveiled*, trans. Š.L. Macgregor Mathers (1887; rpt. New York: Samuel Weiser, 1978).
- Rossi, Paolo, *Francis Bacon: From Magic to Science*, trans. Sacha Rabinovitch (Chicago: Chicago UP, 1968).
- Roth, Cecil, *Anglo-Jewish Letters, 1158-1919* (London: Soncino, 1938).

- , "The Jews of Malta," *TJHSE*, 12 (1928–31), 187–251.
- , "The Middle Period of Anglo-Jewish History (1290–1655) Reconsidered," *TJHSE*, 19 (1955–59), 1–12.
- Roth, Norman, "Social and Intellectual Currents in England in the Century Preceding the Jew Bill of 1753," Cornell University, Ph.D. Dissertation, 1978.
- Routh, E.M.G., *Tangier: England's Lost Atlantic Outpost, 1661–1684* (London: J. Murray, 1912).
- Routledge, F.J., ed., *Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers Preserved in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1932).
- Rubens, Peter Paul, *The Letters of Peter Paul Rubens*, trans. Ruth Magurn (1955; Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1971).
- Rutherford, George, Lord, *The Moors Baffled, being a Discourse concerning Tangier* (Edinburgh: T. and W. Ruddiman, 1738).
- Rutherford, Samuel, *A Survey of the Spirituall Antichrist, Opening the Secrets of Familisme and Antinomianism* (London, 1648).
- Ryan, W.F. and Charles B. Schmidt, *Pseudo-Aristotle, The Secret of Secrets: Sources and Influences* (London: Warburg Institute, 1982).
- Rykvert, Joseph, *The First Moderns: The Architects of the Eighteenth Century* (Boston: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1980).
- Rylands, W. Harry, "A Word on the Legends of the Compagnonnage," *AQC*, 2 (1889), 52–71.
- Sadler, John, *Masquerade du Ciel* (London: R.B. for S.C., 1640).
- Samuel, Edgar R., "Portuguese Jews in Jacobean London," *TJHSE*, 18 (1953–55), 171–230.
- Samuel, Wilfrid, "Isaac Alvarez, Court Jeweller," *MJHSE*, 3 (1937), 100–03.
- , "The Jewish Oratories of Cromwellian London," *MJHSE*, Part III (1937), 46–55.
- , "A Review of the Jewish Colonists in Barbados in the Year 1680," *TJHSE*, 13 (1932–35), 1–111.
- , "Sir William Davidson, Royalist, and the Jews," *TJHSE*, 14 (1935–39), 39–79.
- Sarton, George, *A History of Science* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1959).
- , *Introduction to the History of Science* (Baltimore: Williams and Wilkins, 1947).
- Scarborough, Charles, *Bibliotheca Scarburghiana* (London: Bateman, 1694–95).
- Scholem, Gershom, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1960).
- , *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, rev. ed. (1941; New York: Schocken, 1954).
- , "A Note on a Kabbalistic Treatise on Contemplation," in Seyed Hossein Nasr, ed., *Mélange Offerts à Henry Corbin* (Tehran: Tehran UP, 1977), 668–69.
- Scot, Patrick, *Omnibus and Singulis* (London: William Stansby, 1619).
- , *The Tillage of Light* (London: W. Lee, 1623).
- Scot, Reginald, *The Discoverie of Witchcraft*, introd. Montagu Summers (London: John Rodker, 1930).
- Scott, Andrew, ed., "Letters of John Graham of Claverhouse," *Miscellany of Scottish Historical Society*, 11 (1990), 240–65.
- Scott, Sir Walter, *Castle Dangerous* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1923).
- , ed., *The Secret History of the Court of James the First* (Edinburgh: John Ballantyne, 1811).
- Schuchard, Marsha Keith, "Leibniz, Benzeliuss, and Swedenborg: the Kabbalistic Roots of Swedish Illuminism," in Allison Coudert, Richard Popkin, and Gordon Weiner, eds., *Leibniz, Mysticism, and Religion* (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1998), 84–106.
- , "Ramsay, Swift, and the Jacobite-Masonic Version of the Stuart Restoration," in Joscelyn Godwin, ed., *Esoterisme, Gnoses et Imaginaire Symbolique: Melanges offerts à Antoine Faivre* (Louvain: Peeters 2001), 491–505.

- , "Swedenborg, Jacobitism, and Freemasonry," in Erland Brock, ed., *Swedenborg and His Influence* (Bryn Athyn: Academy of New Church, 1988), 359–79.
- , "The Young Pretender and Jacobite Freemasonry: New Light from Sweden on His Role as 'Hidden Grand Master,'" in Donald Horward, ed., *The Consortium on Revolutionary Europe* (Tallahassee: Florida State UP, 1994), 363–72.
- Seaton, Ethel, *Literary Relations Between England and Scandinavia in the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1935).
- Sed-Rajna, Gabrielle, "Un Diagramme Kabbalistique de la Bibliothèque de Gilles de Viterbo," in *Hommage à George Vajda* (Louvain, 1980), 365–76.
- , "L'Influence de Jean Scot sur la Doctrine Kabbaliste Azriel de Gérone," in *Jean Scot Érigène et l'Histoire de la Philosophie* (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1977), 453–62.
- Sellin, Paul, *So Doth, So is Religion: John Donne and Diplomatic Contexts in the Reformed Netherlands, 1619–1620* (Columbia: Missouri UP, 1988).
- Sendivogius, Michael, *A New Light of Alchymie*, trans. John French (London: Richard Cotes, 1650).
- Seters, W.H. van, "Antoni van Leeuwenhoek in Amsterdam," *Notes and Records of Royal Society*, 9 (1952), 36–45.
- Seton, Sir Bruce Gordon, *The House of Seton: A Study of Lost Causes* (Edinburgh: Lindsay and Macleod, 1939).
- Shadwell, Thomas, *The Virtuoso*, ed. Marjorie Nicholson and David Rodes (Lincoln: Nebraska UP, 1966).
- Shane, Arthur, "Jacob Judah Leon of Amsterdam (1602–1675) and His Models of the Temple of Solomon and the Tabernacle," *AQC*, 96 (1983), 146–69.
- , "Rabbi Jacob Judah Leon (Temple) of Amsterdam (1603–1675) and His Connections with England," *TJHSE*, 21 (1968), 214–31.
- Shaw, Idris, *The Sufis* (London: W.H. Allen, 1964).
- Sharpe, Kevin, "The Image of Virtue: the Court and Household of Charles I, 1625–1642," in D. Starkey, *English Court*, 226–60.
- Sherman, John, *John Dee: The Politics of Reading and Writing in the English Renaissance* (Amherst: Massachusetts UP, 1995).
- Sibbald, Robert, *Bibliotheca Sibbaldiana* (Edinburgh, 1722).
- , *Catalogus Bibliothecae Sibbaldianae* (Edinburgh, 1707).
- , *The Remains of Sir Robert Sibbald, Knight, M.D.* (Edinburgh: T.S. Stevenson, 1833).
- Sidney, Philip, *Miscellaneous Prose of Sir Philip Sidney*, eds. Katherine Duncan-Jones and Jan van Dorsten (Oxford: Clarendon, 1973).
- Silman, Yochanan, *Philosopher and Poet: Judah Halevi, the "Kuzari," and the Evolution of His Thought*, trans. L.J. Schram (Albany: State University of New York, 1993).
- Simms, J.G., "John Toland (1670–1722), a Donegal Heretic," *Irish Historical Studies*, 16 (1969), 304–20.
- Simon, Maurice and Harry Sperling, eds., *The Zohar* (1934; rpt. New York: Soncino, 1973).
- Simson, Otto von, *The Gothic Cathedral*, rev. ed. (1956; New York: Pantheon, 1965).
- Simpson, Grant, ed., *Scotland and Scandinavia* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1990).
- Sinclair, George, "Scotsmen Serving the Swede," *SHR*, 9 (1912), 37–51.
- Sire, H.J.A., *The Knights of Malta* (New Haven: Yale UP, 1994).
- Siren, Oswald, *Nicodemus Tessin D.Y:s Studieresor* (Stockholm: Norstedt, 1914).
- Skovgaard, Joakim, *A King's Architecture: Christian IV and His Buildings* (London: Hugh Evelyn, 1973).
- Slawinski, Maurice, "Rhetoric and Science/Rhetoric of Science/Rhetoric as Science," in Stephen Pumfrey, Paolo Rossi, and Maurice Slawinski, eds., *Science Culture and Popular Belief in Renaissance Europe* (Manchester: Manchester UP, 1991), 71–99.
- Small, J., "Sketches of Later Scottish Alchemists," *PSSA* (1876), 4410–36.

- Smith, Logan, *The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1907).
- Smith, Morton, *Clement of Alexandria and the Secret Gospel of Mark* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1973).
- , *Jesus the Magician* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1978).
- Smuts, R. Malcolm, *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia: Pennsylvania UP, 1987).
- Sorbière, Samuel, *A Voyage to England* (London: J. Woodward, 1709).
- Spencer, Edward, *A Breife Epistle to the Learned Menasseh ben Israel, in Answere to His, Dedicated to the Parliament* (London, 1650).
- Speth, G.W., ed., *Masonic Reprints of the Lodge Quatuor Coronati, #2076. London* (Margate: Keble's Gazette, 1891).
- Sprat, Thomas, *Observations on Monsieur de Sorbière's Voyage into England, Written to Dr. Wren* (1665; London, 1708).
- Srigley, Michael, "The Influence of Continental Familism in England after 1570," in Gunnar Sorelius and Michael Srigley, eds., *Cultural Exchange Between European Nations During the Renaissance*, (Uppsala: Uppsala UP, 1994), 97–110.
- Staley, Edgcombe, *The Guilds of Florence* (1906; rpt. New York: Benjamin Blom, 1967).
- Statutes of the Order of the Temple* (Edinburgh, 1843).
- Steele, Robert and Earl of Crawford, eds., *Tudor and Stuart Proclamations, 1485–1714* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1910).
- Stell, Geoffrey, "Architecture: the Changing Needs of Society," in Jennifer Brown, ed., *Scottish Society in the Fifteenth Century* (London: Edward Arnold, 1977), 154–83.
- Stevens, John, *The Journal of John Stevens*, ed. Robert Murray (Oxford: Clarendon, 1912).
- Stevenson, David, "The English Devil of Keeping State: Élite Manners and the Downfall of Charles I in Scotland," in Roger Mason and Norman Macdougall, eds., *People and Power in Scotland: Essays in Honour of T.C. Smout* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1992), 126–44.
- , *The First Freemasons: Scotland's Early Lodges and Their Members* (Aberdeen: Aberdeen UP, 1988).
- , "The 'Letter on Sovereign Power' and the Influence of Jean Bodin on Political Thought in Scotland," *SHR*, 61 (1982), 24–43.
- , "Masonry, Symbolism, and Ethics in the Life of Sir Robert Moray, FRS," *Proceedings of Society of Antiquaries of Scotland*, 114 (1984), 405–31.
- , *The Origins of Freemasonry: Scotland's Century (1590–1710)* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988).
- , *Scotland's Last Royal Wedding: The Marriage of James VI and Anne of Denmark* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1997).
- Stitskin, Leon, *Judaism as a Philosophy: The Philosophy of Abraham Bar Hiyya* (Brooklyn: Bloch, 1960).
- Stone, John, *Enchiridion of Fortification* (London, 1645).
- Stone, Nicholas, *The Notebook and Account Book of Nicholas Stone*, ed. Walter Spiers. Walpole Society, VII (Oxford, 1919).
- Strafford, Thomas Wentworth, Earl of, *The Earl of Strafford's Letters and Dispatches*, ed. George Radcliffe (London, 1739).
- Stringer, K.J., *Essays on the Nobility of Scotland* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1985).
- Strong, Roy, *Britannia Triumphans: Inigo Jones, Rubens, and Whitehall Palace* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1980).
- Stuart, John, "The Papers of the Right Honourable Lord Torpichen at Calder House," *HMC: Second Report* (London, 1871).
- Stubbe, Henry, *Legends No Histories* (London, 1670).
- Sukenik, E.L., *Ancient Synagogues in Palestine and Greece* (London: Oxford UP, 1934).
- Summerson, John, *Architecture in Britain, 1530–1830* (London: Penguin, 1953).

- , ed., *Concerning Architecture: Essays on Architectural Writers and Writing Presented to Nikolaus Pevsner* (London: Allen Lane, 1968).
- Surenhusius, Guilielmus, *Mischna* (Amsterdam: Borstius, 1698–1703).
- Sutch, Victor, *Gilbert Sheldon, Architect of Anglican Survival* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973).
- Swaan, William, *The Gothic Cathedral* (New York: Doubleday, 1969).
- Swift, Jonathan, *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift*, ed. Harold Williams (Oxford: Clarendon, 1963).
- , *Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*, ed. Herbert Davis (Oxford: Shakespeare Head, 1962).
- , *A Tale of a Tub*, 2nd ed., eds. A.C. Guthkelch and D.N. Smith, (Oxford: Clarendon, 1958).
- , *The Works of Jonathan Swift*, ed. Sir Walter Scott (Edinburgh: Archibald Constable, 1824).
- Tait, A.A., "The Protectorate Citadels of Scotland," *AH*, 8 (1965), 12–17.
- Tapié, Victor, *France in the Age of Louis XIII and Richelieu*, trans. D.M. Lockie (1952; London: Macmillan, 1974).
- Tasso, Torquato, *Godfrey of Boulogne*, trans. E. Fairfax; rev. ed. John Bill (London: John Bill, 1624).
- Taylor, A.J., "English Builders in Scotland during the War of Independence: A Record of 1304," *SHR*, 34 (1955), 44–45.
- Taylor, René, "Architecture and Magic: Considerations on the *Idea* of the Escorial," in Douglas Fraser, Howard Hibbard, and Milton Lewine, eds., *Essays in the History of Architecture Presented to Rudolf Wittkower* (London: Phaidon, 1967), 81–109.
- Temple, William, *Five Miscellaneous Essays*, ed. Samuel Holt (Ann Arbor: Michigan UP, 1963).
- Tessin, Georg, *Die Deutsche Regimenter der Krone Schweden* (Cologne, 1965).
- Thorndike, Lynn, *The History of Magic and Experimental Science* (New York: Macmillan, 1928–58).
- , *Michael Scot* (London: Thomas Nelson, 1965).
- , *The "Sphere" of Sacrobosco and Its Commentators* (Chicago: Chicago UP, 1949).
- Thoren, Victor, *The Lord of Uraniborg: A Biography of Tycho Brahe* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1900).
- Thorpe, John, "Old Masonic Manuscript. A Fragment," *Lodge of Research*, No. 2429, *Leicester. Transactions for Year 1926–27*, 40–48.
- Thory, Claude, *Acta Latamorum, ou Chronologie de l'Histoire de la Franche-Maçonnerie* (Paris: Pierre-Elie Dufart, 1815).
- Toland, John, *Reasons for Naturalizing the Jews in Great Britain and Ireland* (London, 1714).
- Tonge, Ezerel, *Jesuits Assassins: or the Popish Plot Further Declared* (London: J. Darley, 1680).
- Topsell, Edward, *The History of Serpents* (London: William Jaggard, 1608).
- Townshend, Aurelian, *Aurelian Townshend's Poems and Masks*, ed. E.K. Chambers (Oxford: Clarendon, 1912).
- Trench, Charles, *Grace's Card: Irish Catholic Landlords, 1690–1800* (Dublin: Mercier, 1997).
- Trimingham, J.S., *The Sufi Orders in Islam* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1971).
- Tuckett, J.E.S., "Dr. Begemann and the Alleged Templar Chapter at Edinburgh in 1745," *AQC*, 33 (1920), 40–62.
- , "The French-Irish Family of Walsh," *AQC*, 38 (1925), 189–96.
- Turnbull, George, *Hartlib, Comenius, and Dury* (London: Hodder, Stoughton, 1947).
- Tytler, Patrick, *Life of the Admirable Crichton*, 2nd. rev. ed. (Edinburgh: W. and C. Tart, 1823).
- Urquhart, Thomas, *The Jewel*, eds. R.D.S. Jackson and R.J. Lyall (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic, 1983).

- Ursinus, J.H., *De Zoroastre Bactriano, Hermete Trismegisto* (Nuremberg, 1661).
- Vaillant, J.P., "Notes and Queries: Rosicrucians," *AQC*, 7 (1894), 83.
- Van den Berg, J., and E.G.E. Van der Wall, eds., *Jewish-Christian Relations in the Seventeenth Century* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1988).
- Vaughan, Thomas, *The Works of Thomas Vaughan*, ed. Alan Rudrum (Oxford: Clarendon, 1984).
- Vaughan, William, *The Golden Fleece* (London: Franklin Williams, 1626).
- Villars, Abbé de Montfaucon, *Comte de Gabalis* (London: William Rider, 1922).
- Voet, Leon, *The Golden Compasses* (Amsterdam: Vangendt, 1969).
- Waite, Arthur E., *The Brotherhood of the Rosy Cross* (1924; rpt. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1993).
- , *A New Encyclopaedia of Freemasonry*, introd. Emmett McLoughlin (1921; New York: Weathervane, 1970).
- Walker, Keith, ed., *John Dryden* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1987).
- Walter, Nickolaus, *Der Thorausleger Aristobolus* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1964).
- Warner, George, *The Library of James VI, 1573–1583*. Miscellanies of Scottish Historical Society, XV (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1893).
- Watson, Robert, *The Political Works of Fletcher of Salton* (London: H.D. Symonds, 1798).
- Webster, Charles, *From Paracelsus to Newton* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982).
- Wedderburn, Robert, *The Complaynt of Scotland (c. 1550)*, ed. A.M. Stewart. Scottish Texts Society, s. 4, v. 11 (Edinburgh, 1979).
- Weeks, Andrew, *Boehme: An Intellectual Biography of a Seventeenth-century Philosopher and Mystic* (Albany: State University of New York, 1991).
- Weemes, John, *The Christian Synagogue*, 4th rev. ed. (London: John Bellamy, 1633).
- , *The Works of Mr. John Weemes* (London: T. Cotes, 1633).
- Weinberger, Leon, *Jewish Prince in Moslem Spain: Selected Poems of Samuel Ibn Gabirol* (Tuscaloosa: Alabama UP, 1973).
- Weldon, Sir Anthony, *The Court and Character of King James* (London, 1651); rpt. in W. Scott, *Secret History*.
- , *A Perfect Description of the People and Country of Scotland* (London, 1659); rpt. in W. Scott, *Secret History*.
- Weston, Gunnar, *Negotiations About Church Unity, 1628–1634* (Uppsala: Lundequistka, 1932).
- Wilkins, John, *The Mathematical and Philosophical Works* (London, 1708).
- Willard, Thomas, "The Rosicrucian Manifestoes in Britain," *Publication of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 77 (1983), 489–95.
- Williams, W.J., "Archbishop Becket and the Masons' Company of London," *AQC*, 41 (1928), 130–57.
- , "Masons of the City of London: Gleanings from the Letters Books and Other Records, A.D. 1293 to A.D. 1594," *AQC*, 45 (1932), 117–64.
- , "A Selection of Wills Made by Testators Described as Freemasons Dated Between 1605 and 1675," *AQC*, 52 (1941), 161–65.
- , "The Use of the Word 'Free Mason' before 1717," *AQC*, 48 (1938), 140–98.
- Williamson, Arthur H., "British Israel and Roman Britain: the Jews and Scottish Models of Polity from George Buchanan to Samuel Rutherford," in Richard Popkin and Gordon Weiner, eds., *Jewish Christians and Christian Jews* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 1994), 98–117.
- , "George Buchanan, Civic Virtue, and Commerce: European Imperialism and its 16th-Century Critics," *SHR*, 75 (1996), 21–37.
- , "The Jewish Dimension of the Scottish Apocalypse: Climate, Covenant, and World Renewal," in Y. Kaplan, *Menasseh ben Israel*, 7–30.
- , "Number and National Consciousness: the Edinburgh Mathematicians and Scottish Political Culture at the Union of the Crowns," in Roger Mason, ed.,

- Scots and Britons: Scottish Political Thought and the Union of 1603* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994), 187–212.
- , “‘A Pil for Pork-Eaters’: Ethnic Identity, Apocalyptic Premises, and the Strange Creation of the Judeo-Scots,” in R.B. Waddington and A.H. Williamson, eds., *The Expulsion of the Jews: 1492 and After* (New York: Garland, 1994), 237–58.
- , *Scottish National Consciousness in the Age of James VI* (Edinburgh: John Donald, 1979).
- Williamson, J.W., *The Myth of the Conqueror: Prince Henry Stuart* (New York: AMS, 1978).
- Willis, John, *The Art of Memory* (London, 1621).
- Willson, David Harris, *King James VI and I* (New York: Holt, 1956).
- Wischnitzer, Mark, *A History of Jewish Crafts and Guilds* (New York: Jonathan David, 1965).
- Wittkower, Rudolph, *Gothic versus Classic: Architectural Projects in Seventeenth-century Italy* (New York: Braziller, 1974).
- Wittkower, Rudolph and Margaret, *Born Under Saturn* (New York: Random House, 1963).
- Wolf, Lucien, “Anglo-Jewish Coats of Arms,” *TJHSE* (1894–95), 153–57.
- , “The Jewry of the Restoration, 1660–1664,” *TJHSE*, 5 (1909), 5–33.
- , “Status of the Jews in England after the Resettlement,” *TJHSE*, 4 (1903), 177–93.
- Wolfson, Elliot, *Through a Speculum that Shines: Vision and Imagination in Medieval Jewish Mysticism* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994).
- Wolfson, Harry A., *Philo* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1947).
- Wood, Anthony à, *Athenae Oxonienses*, 3rd ed., ed. Phillip Bliss (London: Lackington-Allen, 1813).
- Wormald, Jenny, “James VI and I: Two Kings or One?, *History*, 68 (1983), 187–209.
- Worthington, John, *The Diary and Correspondence of John Worthington*, ed. James Crossley (Manchester: Chetham Society, 1847–86).
- Wotton, Henry, *The Elements of Architecture*, ed. Frederick Hard (1624; facs. rpt. Charlottesville: Virginia UP, 1968).
- , *Reliquiae Wottoniana*, ed. Isaac Walton (London, 1672).
- Wren, Christopher, *Parentalia* (London, 1750).
- Yarker, John, “Drummond—Earls of Perth,” *AQC*, 14 (1901), 138.
- , “The Unrecognized Lodges and Degrees of Freemasonry before and after 1717,” *AQC*, 1 (1887–88), 108.
- Yates, Frances, *The Art of Memory* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966).
- , “The Art of Ramon Lull,” *JWCI*, 17 (1954), 115–68.
- , *The French Academies of the Sixteenth Century* (London: Warburg Institute, 1947).
- , *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1964).
- , *John Florio* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1934).
- , *Lull and Bruno: Collected Essays* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982).
- , “Ramon Lull and John Scotus Erigena,” *JWCI*, 23 (1960), 1–44.
- , *The Rosicrucian Enlightenment* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972).
- Zeitlin, Solomon, “The Origin of the Synagogue,” in J. Guttman, *Synagogue*, 14–26.
- Zimmerman, Werner G., *Von den alten zur neuen Freimaurerei: Briefwechsel und Logenreden von Diethelm Lawater nach 1800* (Zurich: Modestia cum Libertate, 1994).

INDEX

- Abarbanel, David, 537
 Abbot, George, Archbishop of
 Canterbury, 354, 364, 423
 Abell, Adam, 138
 Abendana, Isaac, 670, 711–13, 720
 Abendana, Jacob, 550–52, 554,
 592–94, 606, 707n.121, 711–12, 731
 Abraham, 67, 108, 480, 516, 578
 Abraham the Jew, alchemist, 617, 695,
 727
 Abravanel (Abrabanel), Judah
 (see Leo Hebraeus)
 Abulafia, Abraham, 49–50, 55–56, 72,
 83, 202
 Achaius, King of Scotland, 725
 Adamson, Henry, 111–12, 164–65,
 238, 319–22, 372, 402–04, 420–21,
 434–35, 438–39
 Adamson, James, 238
 Adamson, John, 319
 Addison, Lancelot, 713, 734
 Adornes, Anselm, 122–23
 Aesculapius, 117, 291
 Agrippa, Henry Cornelius, 220, 227,
 263, 315, 566, 620–21, 721
 Ahoab, Isaac 626
 Aholiab, 52, 67, 125, 290–91, 595,
 611, 637
 Ainslie, James, 513
 Al-Bakri, 9, 36, 645
 Al-Mansur, Caliph, 31
 Alan the Steward, 80–81
 Albemarle, 1st Duke of (see Monk,
 George)
 Alberti, Leone Battista, 219, 263, 272,
 340
 Aldrovandi, Ulisse, 561, 725
 Alexander, Sir Anthony, 391, 401,
 416–17, 420, 424, 428–30, 433–34,
 437
 Alexander, Henry, 3rd Earl of Stirling,
 433, 436, 438, 440, 445, 450
 Alexander, William, 1st Earl of
 Stirling, 331, 378–79, 385,
 391, 401, 419, 428, 437, 444
 Alexander, William, Lord, 428
 Alexander the Great, King, 117–18
 Alfonsi, Petrus, 68
 Allyon, Solomon, 771
 Alonzo XI, King of Spain, 97
 Alsted, Johan, 398, 553–54, 571, 621,
 686
 Alured, Thomas, 350
 Alvarez, Isaac, 698, 700, 705
 Amama, Sixtinus, 553, 571
 Amasis, King of Egypt, 153
 Amedeus, Alexander, 728
 Anaphiel, 22
 Anatoli, Jacob ben, 64
 Ancram, 1st Earl of (see Kerr,
 Robert)
 Anderson, Henry, 320
 Anderson, Reverend James, 1, 79–81,
 107, 122, 151, 170, 237, 240, 269,
 310–11, 331, 372–73, 416, 447, 474,
 489, 509–10, 521, 587, 631, 645,
 654, 656, 665, 669, 671, 684,
 723–24, 739–40, 746, 774, 777,
 779, 781, 785–86, 789
 Andrae, Johann Valentin, 287, 328,
 342–43, 345–47, 395, 398, 409,
 504, 521–22, 599, 601
 Andrew the Jew, 66
 Anne, Queen of Great Britain, 731,
 757
 Anne of Denmark, Queen of Britain,
 216, 218, 222, 231, 243, 257,
 261, 273, 287, 388
 Antiochus IV, King of Syria, 13, 88,
 125
 Apuleius, 365
 Aquinas, Thomas, 38, 53, 69–70
 Arbuthnot, Dr. John, 784
 Archangelus the Cabalist, 359
 Archie the Jester, 376
 Archimedes, 321, 361, 403
 Argyll, 7th, 8th, and 9th Earls of
 (see Campbell, Archibald)
 Aristobolus, 15, 32
 Aristotle, 36, 46, 64, 67, 114, 398
 Aristotle, Pseudo-, 66–68, 117–18
 Arlington, Earl of (see Bennet,
 Henry)
 Arnold de Villanova, 294, 315, 500

- Arran, 2nd Earl of (see Hamilton, James)
 Arthur, King of Britain, 85, 88, 99
 Ashley Cooper, Anthony, 1st Earl of Shaftesbury, 700, 719, 732
 Ashmole, Elias, 77, 283, 294, 305, 359, 477–81, 484, 486, 488, 500, 504–07, 523, 526, 531–32, 535, 537, 543, 568–70, 581, 589, 596, 600, 604–05, 609–11, 617, 619, 630, 632, 641, 648, 661, 664, 676, 680–85, 687, 710, 716–17, 725, 733, 735, 748, 751, 768
 Athelstan, King of England, 725
 Atkins, James, 441
 Aubrey, John, 177, 259, 523, 642–43, 664, 710, 747, 777–79
 Augustus, Duke of Brunswick, 671
 Auld, William, 95, 170–71
 Averroes, 65–66
 Avicbron (see Gabirol, Solomon Ibn)
 Aytoun, George, 440
 Aytoun, John, 140
 Aytoun, William, 440
 Azriel of Gerona, 71

 Backhouse, Samuel, 505
 Backhouse, William, 505–06, 641, 687
 Bacon, Sir Anthony, 231, 258
 Bacon, Francis, Baron Verulam and Viscount St. Albans, 231, 255, 257–60, 266–67, 279, 324, 331, 350, 361, 370, 382–85, 398, 467, 485, 490, 599, 607, 610, 638–39, 713, 727, 747
 Bacon, Sir Nicholas, 255
 Bacon, Roger, 66–70, 78, 117, 127, 220, 251–52, 358, 469, 617
 Bahir, Rabbi, 359
 Balanqual, Sir Walter, Dean of Rochester, 388
 Balcarres, 1st, 2nd, and 3rd Earls of (see Lindsay, David, Alexander, and Colin)
 Balcarres, Countess (see Mackenzie, Anna)
 Baldwin I, King of Jerusalem, 152
 Baliol, John, King of Scotland, 85, 87
 Barbour, John, 102
 Barnet, Jacob, 302, 384
 Basil, Simon, 261, 267, 308
 Bassantine, James, 173
 Basson, Thomas, 234

 Basson, Godfrey, 304
 Bavaria, Duke of, 350
 Baxter, Richard, 571, 579
 Bayer, Johann, 306
 Bayle, Pierre, 784
 Beale, Dr. John, 599, 605, 622, 638
 Beaton, David, Cardinal and Archbishop of Scotland, 145, 148–49
 Beckman, Martin, 643, 735
 Bellenden, Sir William, 524, 542, 570, 591
 Bembo, Pietro, Cardinal, 563
 Bennet, Henry, Earl of Arlington, 644, 656, 670–71, 676–77, 681, 699–701, 722–23, 746, 787
 Bentinck, William, 1st Earl of Portland, 777
 Berkshire, Earl of, 670
 Bernard, Edward, 661
 Bernard de Clairvaux, 79
 Bernini, Giovanni Lorenzo, 650
 Bezalel (Bezaleel), 10–11, 20, 23, 27, 52–53, 67, 125, 197, 290–91, 595, 611, 637
 Bill, John, 276
 Billingsley, Henry, 219, 265
 Blacader, Robert, Archbishop of Glasgow, 128, 148
 Blagge, Margaret, Lady Godolphin, 685–87
 Blair, Hugh, 773
 Blake, William, ix–xi, 1, 793
 Boccaccio, Giovanni, 66
 Boccacini, Traiano, 285–86, 377, 790
 Bodin, Jean, 212–13, 227, 265–66, 278
 Boece, Hector, 106–07, 125, 137, 139, 246
 Boehme, Jacob, 486–88, 601, 613, 790
 Boisivon, Ambassador, 463
 Bolton, Edmund, 329
 Bonet, Honoré, 114, 116
 Boniface VIII, Pope, 213
 Bonatti, Guido, 127
 Bonneville, Nicholas de, 581, 585
 Bononien, Petrus von, 93
 Booker, John, 616
 Booth, Sir George, 585, 628
 Boreel, Adam, 381–82, 454–55, 457, 605–06
 Borri, Francesco Giuseppi, 609, 623–24, 674, 713
 Borrichius, Oiaus, 614n.55
 Borromini, Francesco, 474
 Boswell, James, 233

- Boswell of Auchinleck, John, 233–34
 Bothwell, 5th Earl of (see Hepburn, Francis Stewart)
 Bothwell, 4th Earl of (see Hepburn, James)
 Boulter, Robert, 674–75
 Bower, Walter, 105, 112
 Boyle, Richard, 3rd Earl of Burlington, 793
 Boyle, Robert, 569, 597, 599–601, 603, 609, 616, 625, 679, 720
 Boyle, Roger, 1st Earl of Orrery, 678–80, 689
 Brek, Simon, 63
 Brewer, Hugh, 477
 Brooke, Richard, 617, 653
 Broun, John, 429
 Brouncker, William, Viscount, 605, 634–35, 639, 644, 716
 Brown, David, 773
 Browne, Adam, 466
 Brownloe, S., 602, 658
 Bruce, Alexander, 2nd Earl of Kincardine, 468, 546, 552–56, 559–60, 562, 564–67, 569–70, 576, 579, 583–88, 596, 603–05, 609–111, 614, 621, 627, 630, 638, 646–47, 651, 656, 658, 662–65, 668, 683–85, 688, 708, 723–24, 750, 780, 782, 787
 Bruce, Robert the (see Robert I)
 Bruce, Robert, 2nd Earl of Elgin and 1st Earl of Ailesbury, 474, 569, 619, 642
 Bruce, Thomas, 3rd Earl of Elgin and 2nd Earl of Ailesbury, 728, 753
 Bruce, Sir William, 575–76, 580–81, 582, 583, 587, 645, 647, 665, 684, 688, 707, 724, 740, 750, 755, 764, 775–76, 780, 787, 793
 Bruce of Culross, Sir George, 319, 352
 Bruno, Giordano, 202–06, 217, 227, 233–34, 236, 243, 250, 273, 315–16, 335, 360, 398, 425, 553, 727
 Brutus (Brut), 79, 85, 88, 241, 247, 271
 Buc, Sir George, 47, 278, 341
 Buchanan, George, 136, 141–42, 151, 154–56, 172–73, 178, 181–81, 194, 204, 254, 300, 759
 Buckingham, Duchess of, 760
 Buckingham, 1st and 2nd Dukes of (see Villiers, George)
 Bungay, Thomas, 127
 Bureus, Johannes, 293, 395–96, 539, 599
 Burlington, 3rd Earl of (see Boyle, Richard)
 Burnet, Alexander, Bishop of Glasgow, 692
 Burnet, Gilbert, Bishop of Salisbury, 369, 572, 576, 587, 624–27, 638, 647, 651, 665, 685, 688, 726, 757, 783
 Burns, Robert, 785
 Burton, Robert, 396
 Butler, James, 1st Duke of Ormonde, 537, 610, 718
 Butler, Samuel, 611–17, 620–23, 654, 680, 696–98, 707–09, 716–20, 758, 790
 Byrom, John, 793
 Cagliostro, Alessandro, Count, 793
 Camillo, Giulio, 245, 250, 265–66
 Campanella, Tomasso, 293, 694
 Campbell, Archibald, 7th Earl of Argyll, 283, 506
 Campbell, Archibald, 8th Earl of Argyll, 510
 Campbell, Archibald, 9th Earl of Argyll, 619, 642
 Campunall, Mordecai, 546, 548
 Capnio (see Reuchlin, Johann)
 Carafa, Gregory, 744
 Cardano, Geronimo, 156–61, 172, 199, 207, 220, 224, 226–27, 250, 263, 265, 272, 294, 324, 365, 478, 597, 621, 686, 714, 748
 Carew, Thomas, 410, 425–26, 441
 Cariston of Seton, Sir John, 212
 Carl X, King of Sweden, 534, 540, 542, 573, 599
 Carl XI, King of Sweden, 542n.77, 776
 Carl XII, King of Sweden, 776, 793
 Carmichael, John, 458, 463
 Cartwright, Ebenezer and Joanna, 526
 Casanova de Seingalt, Giovanni Giacomo, 157, 793
 Casaubon, Isaac, 298, 301–03, 384, 536
 Castel, Edmund, 712
 Catherine of Braganza, Queen of Britain, 590, 678, 701, 730

- Caus, Salomon de, 274
 Caussin, Nicolas, 361
 Caxton, William, 114
 Cavalleria, de, family, 45
 Cebes the Theban, 659–60
 Cecil, Robert, 1st Earl of Salisbury, 269
 Chamberlain, John, 353
 Chapman, George, 270
 Charlemagne, 48, 277, 341
 Charles I, King of Britain, 194, 267, 274, 276, 279, 287, 295, 299, 307, 316–17, 330, 335, 342, 350–52, 361–62, 365–69, 373–494 *passim*, 513, 524, 526–29, 567, 581, 586, 596, 628, 630, 633, 635, 649, 674, 722, 746,
 Charles II, King of Britain, 317, 447, 485–86, 489–90, 495, 508–50, 565, 567, 571–73, 576–77, 579–736 *passim*, 740, 743, 745, 748, 753, 774, 781, 786
 Charles V, Holy Roman Emperor, 137
 Charles Louis, Elector Palatine, 533–34, 598
 Charleton, Dr. Walter, 609
 Chaucer, Geoffrey, 110
 Child, Dr. Robert, 497
 Christian II, Elector of Saxony, 281
 Christian IV, King of Denmark, 218, 257, 261
 Christina, Queen of Sweden, xi, 510, 524, 532–33, 537, 539–43, 571, 599, 674, 717
 Cibber, Gabriel, 746
 Clarendon, 1st Earl of (see Hyde, Edward)
 Cleland, James, 262–67, 286, 363–65
 Clement V, Pope, 75
 Clement VII, Pope, 103
 Clement of Alexandria, 20
 Cleveland, John, 464–65, 475–77, 496
 Clifford, Thomas, 1st Baron Clifford, 700
 Clodius, Frederick, 601, 713
 Clook (Clough), Owagh, Colonel, 570–71
 Cochrane, Thomas, 122–23, 165
 Cochrane, Sir William, 688, 742
 Cockburn, John, 757
 Coke, Sir John, 442
 Collier, James, 477
 Colonna, Francesco, 325–29, 413, 556
 Colt, John, 423
 Comenius, Jan Amos, 455, 457, 460, 467, 483, 523, 532, 597, 599, 637
 Comyn, King of Scotland, 89
 Condé, Louis II, de Bourbon, Prince de, 519
 Congreve, William, 780
 Constable, Michael, 354
 Conti, Armand de Bourbon, Prince de, 519
 Conway, Anne, 677, 689
 Cooper, William, 694
 Copland of Udoch, Patrick, 222
 Coronel, Sir Augustin, 589–90, 592, 606
 Cosmas Indicopleustes, 28
 Cosway, Richard, 793
 Cowley, Abraham, 459, 474, 508–09, 580, 590, 604, 606–07, 636
 Cozok, 467
 Craig, Alexander, 320
 Craig, Dr. John, 220
 Craven, William, Earl of, 698
 Crawford-Lindsay, John, 17th Earl of, 584, 585n.234, 628
 Creagh, Sir Michael, 761
 Cramer, B.G., 778
 Cremer, Abbot of Westminster, 77
 Crescenzo, Giovanni Baptista, Marquis della Torre, 412
 Crichton, James, "The Admirable," 183, 194, 298, 478, 514
 Croll, Oswald, 694
 Cromartie, Lord, 295
 Cromwell, Henry, 595
 Cromwell, Oliver, 77n.57, 213, 453, 473–74, 491–94, 504, 508, 510, 512, 514, 519, 523–47, 554, 569, 571–76, 588–89, 596–97, 599, 602, 620, 639–40, 649, 653, 656, 669, 671, 674, 767
 Cromwell, Richard, 574–75
 Cromwell, Thomas, 139
 Crowley, Ambrose, 775
 Culpepper, Nicholas, 457
 Cunningham, Sir Alexander, 390
 Cunningham, Sir David, 313, 390–91, 394, 516
 Cunningham, William, 9th Earl of Glencairn, 582, 587
 Cunningham of Robertland, Sir David, 243, 246–47, 260–61, 390
 Cure, Nicholas, 260, 268, 330–31

- Cutler, Lady, 709
 Czartorisky, Prince Augustus, 793

 Da Costa, David, 541, 589
 Da Costa, Solomon, 647
 Damian, John, 127, 376
 Daniel, Samuel, 273
 Dante Alighieri, 58, 66
 Da Vega, 670
 Davenant, William, 440, 443–44, 483, 648–49
 David, King of Israel, *passim*
 David I, King of Scotland, 78–80, 88, 92, 103, 111, 174, 767–68
 David II, King of Scotland, 98–101, 104
 David, Earl of Huntingdon, 80, 103, 767
 Davidson, John, 226
 Davidson, John (fl. 1660), 585
 Davidson (Davison), Sir William, 529–30, 533, 536–37, 542–44, 546–48, 550–51, 554, 564, 579, 589, 591–94, 606, 664, 670, 787
 Davison (Davisson, Davidson), Dr. William, 460–62, 472, 507, 514, 523, 543, 564
 Davy, 713
 De Bry, Theodore, 305
 De Castro, Dr. Benedict, 532–33
 De le Coste, Bento, 589
 Dee, Dr. Arthur, 286–87, 303, 377, 432, 504–05
 Dee, John, 161, 206–07, 219–21, 251–55, 263–66, 280, 286, 290, 293, 296–97, 303, 334, 342–43, 347, 360, 401, 469, 497, 502, 505, 561, 598, 614, 623, 639, 703, 711, 727, 748
 Defoe, Daniel, 643
 Denham, Sir John, 452–53, 508–09, 516–17, 569–70, 604, 619, 629, 631–32, 637–38, 642, 648, 653, 663, 664–655, 697
 Denison, John, 385
 Denison, Stephen, 385–86
 Dermott, Laurence, 702–03, 707
 Desaguliers, Jean Theophilus, 777
 Descartes, René, 714
 Dickinson, Edmund, 651
 Dickson (Dicson), Alexander, Master of Memory, 203–07, 222–24, 226–27, 234–36, 243, 314
 Dickson, Alexander, Professor of Hebrew, 728
 Dickson, Master, 238
 Digby, Sir Kenelm, 360, 566, 604, 609, 614, 616, 634, 748
 Dillon, Arthur, 769
 Dillon, Theobald, 7th Viscount Dillon, 769
 Dingwall, Lord (see Preston, Richard)
 Dionysius the Areopagite, 71, 330, 377, 405, 498
 Dohna, Baron, 350
 Doncaster, Viscount (see Hay, James)
 Don John of Austria, 211
 Donne, John, 324, 349
 Donnolo, Shabbetai, 34
 Dorchester, Marquess of, 634
 Dorn, Gerhard, 499, 714
 Douglas, Archibald, 690
 Douglas, Gavin, 124–25
 Douglas, George, 397
 Douglas, George, Earl of Dumbarton, 735
 Douglas, James, 4th Earl of Morton, 182, 184–85
 Douglas, Sir James, 97
 Douglas, William, 1st Duke of Queensbury, 739–42, 767
 Doyle, Bernard, 760
 Drake, Dr. Francis, 706n.120
 Drebbel, Cornelius, 345, 469, 505
 Drummond, James, 4th Earl and 1st Duke of Perth, 727, 729, 739–42, 750, 751, 763–64, 784, 792
 Drummond, James, 5th Earl and 2nd Duke of Perth, 784, 792
 Drummond, John, 315
 Drummond, John, 4th Earl of Melfort, 740, 751, 754–55, 764–66, 768, 780, 783–84
 Drummond, Patrick, 726
 Drummond of Balhaldie, Alexander, 766
 Drummond of Carnock, Sir Robert, 185, 196, 315
 Drummond of Hawthornden, Sir William, 122, 196, 283, 315, 324–27, 329, 418, 421, 426, 434–35
 Drusius (Jan Van der Dreische), 299–301, 405, 553, 571
 Drusius, Jean, 300
 Dryden, John, 602, 680, 694, 729–31, 733, 735, 739, 742–44, 746, 769, 779–80
 Du Bartas, Guillaume de Salluste, Sieur, 186–92, 194, 196–201, 203,

- 205, 208–17, 230, 248–49, 275,
325, 343, 377, 502
- Du Bosc, M. de, 482
- Dugdale, Sir William, 452, 477, 568,
664, 747, 778
- Dumbarton, Earl of (see Douglas,
George)
- Dundas, Sir George, 128–29, 132–33,
137
- Dundee, 1st and 3rd Viscounts of
(see Graham, John and David)
- Dunfermline, 1st, 2nd, and 3rd Earls
of (see Seton, Alexander)
- Dürer, Albrecht, 263, 634
- Dury, John, 381, 395, 397–400,
409–10, 430–32, 455–58, 466–68,
482–85, 505, 515, 523, 532–34,
537, 549–50, 597, 599, 603,
605–06, 608, 616
- Dysart, 1st Earl of (see Murray,
William)
- Edward I, King of England, 61,
81–89, 528
- Edward II, King of England, 77,
90–91, 102
- Edward III, King of England, 77n.57,
98–101, 342, 682
- Edward VI, King of England, 149,
161
- Eglinton, 8th Earl of (see
Montgomery, Alexander)
- Eliazar Bar-Isaiah, 532
- Elijah, 50
- Eliot, Sir John, 352
- Elizabeth I, Queen of England,
161–63, 168–75, 206, 216, 219,
222, 231, 234–35, 240, 244, 246,
251, 253, 257, 260, 267–68,
273–74, 384, 415, 630, 674, 745
- Ellam, John and Richard, 477
- Elphinstone, William, Bishop of
Aberdeen, 125–28
- Enoch, 108
- Erasmus, Desiderius, 135–37
- Erde, William, 182, 189, 201
- Erigena, John Scotus, 71–72, 117,
126
- Errol, 9th Earl of (see Hay, Francis)
- Erskine, Sir Charles, 681, 683
- Erskine, Charles, 5th or 10th Earl of
Mar, 765
- Erskine, John, 1st or 6th Earl of Mar,
184, 225, 274, 363
- Erskine, John, 2nd or 7th Earl of
Mar, 184
- Erskine, John, 6th or 11th Earl of
Mar, 766, 793
- Erskine, Thomas, 225
- Erskine of Innerteil, Sir George, 183,
283, 294–95, 297, 304, 317, 363,
393–94, 402, 404, 421, 487
- Esther, 152
- Euclid, 36, 46, 64, 108, 111, 135,
219, 265, 334, 468, 470, 480,
502, 578, 598, 614, 673, 703, 741
- Eusebius, 20
- Evans, Arise, 531–32, 534–35, 537
- Evelyn, John, 19, 369, 468, 470–72,
474, 522, 568–70, 596–97,
599–601, 604–05, 607, 630,
636–39, 644, 648, 654, 662–63,
676–77, 679–80, 710, 718, 722,
735, 739, 746–48, 751, 753–54,
778–79
- Eyler, Martin, 721
- Ezekiel, 12, 21, 23, 34, 596
- Ezra, Abraham Ibn, 39–40, 44, 182,
298, 405, 617
- Fairfax, Edward, 275
- Fairfax, Sir Thomas, 570, 583, 640
- Falconer, John, 727
- Falk, Dr. Samuel Jacob, x, 793
- Farley, Henry, 309, 314, 335–37,
339–40
- Favyn, André, 340–42, 681–82, 725
- Felton, John, 389
- Ferdinand II, King of Bohemia and
Holy Roman Emperor, 348
- Fergus I, King of Scotland, 61, 63,
418, 739, 741, 789
- Ferguson, William, 701
- Ficino, Marsilio, 135, 289, 377, 565
- Fielding, Henry, 744–45, 770, 774
- Fitzgerald, John, Colonel, 736, 766
- FitzJames, Henry, 744, 768–69
- Flamel, Nicholas, 471, 621, 695
- Flamel, Pernella, 471
- Fletcher of Saltoun, Andrew, 782
- Fletcher of Saltoun, Sir Robert, 625,
782
- Florio, John, 243
- Fludd, Dr. Leven, 497, 504–05, 584,
617–18
- Fludd, Dr. Robert, 39, 304–08,
343–45, 347–48, 356, 358–61, 377,
386, 392–94, 399, 422, 435–36,

- 462, 469, 477, 498, 500, 508,
523, 562, 566, 571, 583, 598, 613,
618, 620, 712, 714, 727, 748
Forbes, Arthur, 700
Fordun, John of, 103
Forman, Simon, 252, 306
Fortescue, Sir Nicholas, 460n.46
Foster, Samuel, 597
Foster, William, 399
Fowler, William, 199–200, 203, 225,
243, 262, 315
Francia, Francis, 793
Franco, Solomon, 531, 537, 543, 589,
676, 701
François I, King of France, 140
François II, King of France, 167
François, Duke of Guise, 14
Frankenberg, Abraham, 540n.68
Franklin, Benjamin, 793
Fraser (Frazer), Dr. Alexander, 509,
572, 582, 586, 653
Frazer, Edouard, 582
Fréart, Roland, Sieur de Chambry,
637
Frederick, Duke of Brunswick, 671
Frederick I, Duke of Württemberg,
283–85
Frederick II, Holy Roman Emperor
and King of Sicily, 64–65
Frederick II, King of Denmark, 217
Frederick V, Elector Palatine, “Winter
King” of Bohemia, 278–80, 286,
291–92, 342, 349–51, 410
Frederick Henry, Prince, 349, 394
Frederick Henry, Stadholder of
Netherlands, 454
French, John, 522
French, Thomas, 140
Fridwall, Johann, 410
Frizius, Joachim, 392–93, 399, 422,
462, 477, 485, 498, 500, 507
Fuller, Thomas, 14, 618

Gabella, Philip a, 296
Gabirol, Solomon Ibn (Avicbron),
35–39, 46, 66, 69–70, 127, 498
Gadbury, John, 539, 616
Gadbury, Timothy, 539
Gailon (Gayland), 643–45
Gall, John, 164, 320, 402–04
Gassendi, Pierre, 399
Gathelus, 62–63, 69, 85, 89, 103, 108,
184, 204, 236, 241, 291, 322, 341,
578, 790

Gauden, John, Bishop of Worcester,
491
Gaunse, Joachim, 384
Geber, 445
Geoffrey of Monmouth, 79
Gerbier, Balthazar, 352, 373, 377, 433,
483–84, 632–37, 698
George I, Elector of Hanover and
King of Great Britain, 5, 793
Gerbier, Balthazar, 352, 355, 391,
483–85, 586
Gerrard, Reverend, 430
Gezelius, Johannes, 712
Gibbon, Edward, 109–10
Gibbons, Grinling, 654
Gibbs, James, 793
Gibson, Sir Alexander, 587
Glanville, Joseph, 694
Goodrick, Matthew, 313
Giorgio, Francesco di, 272, 500
Glauber, Johann Rudolph, 564
Glencairn, 9th Earl of (see
Cunningham, William)
Godfrey of Bouillon, 116, 152, 174,
275–77, 284, 341, 725
Godolphin, Lord, 687
Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von,
793
Goodman, Godfrey, Bishop of
Gloucester, 367
Goodricke, Sir Henry, 777–79
Gordon, George, 6th Baron Gordon,
793
Gordon, George, 6th Earl of Huntly,
222, 224
Gordon, John, Dean of Salisbury,
247–49
Gordon, Patrick, Professor, 670
Gordon, Patrick, General, 442
Gothier of Lyons, 602
Graham, David, 3rd Viscount Dundee,
767–68
Graham of Claverhouse, John, 1st
Viscount Dundee, 742, 762–63,
765–70
Graunt, John, 595, 607–08
Gray, Sir Andrew, 349
Gregory I, Pope, 29
Gremy, Jacob, 390
Greville, Fulke, 204, 335
Grove, 704
Guise, Charles de, Cardinal of
Lorraine, 150, 153, 168
Guise, Duc de, 305

- Guise, François de, Grand Prior of France, 167–70, 174
 Gustaf III, King of Sweden, 776
 Gustavus Adolphus, King of Sweden, 395–97, 408–10, 441, 464
 Gyllenborg, Count Carl, 793

 Haggai, 167
 Halevi, Judah, 40, 550–52, 555, 592–94, 670
 Hall, Joseph, Bishop of Norwich, 507
 Hamet, Moroccan ambassador, 735
 Hamilton, Alexander, Colonel, 573
 Hamilton, Alexander, General, 396, 450–51, 468, 476–78, 485, 560, 573n.197
 Hamilton, Charles, 775n.133
 Hamilton, Claud, Lord Paisley, 237
 Hamilton, James, Lord Paisley and Earl of Abercorn, 237
 Hamilton, James, 2nd Earl of Arran, 146, 149, 156
 Hamilton, James, 3rd Marquis and 1st Duke of Hamilton, 357, 396, 408–09, 431, 441
 Hamilton, James Douglas, 4th Duke of Hamilton, 643, 707, 775, 776
 Hamilton, John, Archbishop of St. Andrews, 156, 160–61, 237
 Hamilton, William, alchemist, 281–82, 289
 Hamilton of Finnart, Sir James, 133, 139, 143–45, 156, 196
 Hamilton of Milburn, John, 149
 Hancock, William, 84
 Harington, Sir John, 262, 290
 Harley, Sir Edward, 619, 640–43, 646, 648, 660–61, 688–89, 692, 722, 731–32
 Harley, Sir Robert, 619, 641–43, 646, 648
 Harley, Robert, 1st Earl of Oxford, 707
 Hartlib, Samuel, 395, 398–400, 410, 432, 455–57, 467–68, 482–85, 497, 504–05, 516, 523, 537, 569, 597, 599–608, 616–17, 713
 Harvey, Dr. William Harvey, 305, 727
 Haselmeyer, Adam, 285
 Hay, Francis, 9th Earl of Errol, 224
 Hay, Sir George, 1st Earl of Kinnoul, 363, 370, 376, 419–20, 428, 438
 Hay, Sir Gilbert, 114–19, 140
 Hay, Sir James, Viscount Doncaster, 349
 Hay, John, 12th Earl of Errol, 783
 Hay, John, 2nd Earl of Tweeddale, 619, 642, 688–89
 Hay, Richard, 119
 Hearne, Thomas, 360
 Helmont, Francis Mercurius van, 666, 677, 695, 712, 720, 728, 748
 Helmont, Jan Baptista van, 467, 497, 727
 Hemmingsen, Niels, 217, 222, 227
 Henderson, Reverend Alexander, 481
 Henri III, King of France, 198–99, 202
 Henri III, King of Navarre, 168–69, 214, 248; Henri IV, King of France, 276, 285, 298, 373, 633
 Henri d'Angoulême, 202
 Henrietta Maria, Queen of Britain, 373, 408, 414, 445, 453–55, 457, 460, 463, 472, 474–75, 485, 489–90, 509, 527, 579, 581, 586, 633, 635, 641, 649, 673
 Henry III, King of England, 81–83, 664, 747
 Henry IV, King of England, 105
 Henry VII, King of England, 124, 127, 674
 Henry VIII, King of England, 129, 131–49, 272, 274, 453, 674
 Henshaw, Thomas, 468, 470–71, 474, 497, 504, 522, 557, 596, 604
 Hepburn, Francis Stewart, 5th Earl of Bothwell, 223
 Hepburn, James, 4th Earl of Bothwell, 175
 Hepburn, James “Bonaventura,” 298, 305
 Hepburn, Sir John, 442
 Herbert, William, 3rd Earl of Pembroke, 318, 331–33
 Herder, Johann Gottfried von, 793
 Heriot, George, 388
 Hermes Trismegistus, 67, 108, 117, 135, 153, 173, 199, 259, 265, 267, 289, 295, 303, 307, 359, 361, 378, 426, 436, 445, 516, 522, 561, 578, 634, 637, 652, 679, 742
 Herod, King of Judea, 12–17
 Herrera, Juan de, 250–51
 Heydon, John, 583–84, 595, 605, 609–11, 615, 644, 651–53, 656, 694, 790

- Hiël, 181
 Hiber, 63
 Hilliard, Nicholas, 499
 Hiram, King of Tyre, 11, 215, 337, 371, 553, 673, 705–06
 Hiram (and Hiram Abif), 9, 11, 31, 38, 43, 53, 57, 59, 108, 121, 125, 197, 215, 293, 327, 337, 476, 480, 672–73, 736, 743
 Hiyya, Abraham Bar (Savasorda), 44–46, 66, 298
 Hodges, Nathaniel, 539
 Hodges, Thomas, 539
 Hoghelande, Ewald de, 252
 Hollar, Wenscelas, 570
 Holme, Randle, 756
 Honywood, Michael, Dean of Lincoln, 698, 710
 Hooke, Robert, 265, 597, 630, 644, 646, 654, 667, 687, 696, 698–99, 703–04, 706, 709–19, 722, 727, 729, 731, 734, 746
 Hotham, Charles, 487
 Howard, James, 3rd Earl of Suffolk, 535–36
 Howard, Thomas, 2nd Earl of Arundel, 280, 308, 318, 331–33, 365, 416, 441, 453, 474
 Howard, Thomas, 8th Duke of Norfolk, 416n.56
 Howell, James, 61, 412, 528–29
 Hudson, Thomas, 205
 Hugh de Paiens, 45, 78, 174
 Hulsius, Antonio, 550
 Hume, Patrick, 376
 Hume of Polwarth, Sir Patrick, 688
 Huntly, 6th Earl of (see Gordon, George)
 Huygens, Christiaan, 545, 608, 618, 618–19, 621–23, 626, 666
 Huygens, Constantijn, 545–46, 551, 563, 591–92, 618–19, 621–23, 626, 666, 698–703
 Hyde, Edward, 1st Earl of Clarendon, 490, 517, 536, 572, 576, 579, 582–83, 586, 623–24, 649, 653, 655–56
 Inchiquin, 2nd Earl of (see O'Brien, William)
 Irving, James, 175
 Irwin, Captain, 460, 464
 Isaac, 555–58, 560, 685
 Isis, 291
 Jabal, 107
 Jacob, 63, 89, 350, 359, 481, 501, 623, 724
 Jacob, Paul, 369–70
 James I, King of Scotland, 105, 110–12, 165
 James II, King of Scotland, 113
 James III, King of Scotland, 121–24, 165
 James IV, King of Scotland, 123–31, 135,
 James V, King of Scotland, 132–47, 154, 262, 272
 James VI and I, King of Britain, 47, 69, 145, 176–371 *passim*, 384–85, 388, 391–92, 396, 401–02, 417, 419, 423, 433, 439, 447, 493, 505, 507, 535–36, 545, 552, 567, 630, 649, 659, 674, 685, 693, 723, 739, 753, 788
 James VII and II, Duke of York, King of Britain, 3, 5, 408, 483, 590, 596, 653, 680, 682, 684, 711, 719, 723–33, 736, 738–89 *passim*
 James “VIII and III,” the Old Pretender, 82, 491, 757–58, 761
 James, Lord Steward of Scotland, 85
 Jamesone, George, 418
 Japhet, 79, 247
 Jason, 291
 Jefferson, Thomas, 793
 Jeremiah, 42–43
 Jermyyn, Sir Henry, Earl of St. Albans, 474, 509, 586–87, 631–32, 642, 650, 681, 710
 Joabin the Jew, 383–84
 Joachim of Fiore, 292–93, 721
 John of Glasgow, Bishop, 78
 John of St. Thomas of Acre, Brother, 83–84
 John Casimir, King of Poland, 523
 Johnson, Dr. (from Warwick), 710
 Johnson, Samuel, 233
 Johnston, Dr. Arthur, 428
 Johnston, John, 241
 Johnston, Jon, 523
 Johnston, Dr. John, 283
 Jones, Inigo, 256–57, 260–61, 264, 269–71, 273–74, 277, 279, 308, 311–13, 318, 325–29, 331–36, 343, 355–57, 361, 365, 370, 372–73, 391, 401, 406–07, 410–16, 424–29, 433, 436, 447–48, 452–53, 458, 472–73, 483–84, 490, 505, 509, 512, 545,

- 628, 632–33, 635, 637, 647–48, 679, 707, 731
 Jones, John, 761
 Jonson, Ben, 241, 256–57, 260, 270–71, 274, 277, 303–04, 316, 323–29, 345, 355, 376–77, 407, 411–15, 440, 443–44
 Joseph, Hebrew Patriarch, 67
 Josephus, Flavius, 13–17, 67, 104, 107–08, 120, 135, 153, 155, 190, 208, 308, 370, 528, 617, 678, 706
 Joshua, 94–95
 Josiah, King of Judah, 336–37
 Joyce, James, ix, 7
 Judas, 290
 Judith, 152
 Julian the Apostate, 20, 732
 Julius II, Pope, 129
 Juxon, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, 633, 635

 Keirincx, Alexander, 420
 Keith, George, 677, 728
 Kennedy, John, 7th Earl of Cassilis, 688
 Ker, Father, 536
 Kérouailles, Louise de, Duchess of Portsmouth, 781
 Kerr (Ker), Mark, 1st Earl of Lothian, 195, 226, 405–06
 Kerr (Ker), Robert, 1st Earl of Ancram, 243, 262, 265, 273, 278, 294–95, 297, 303, 317, 340, 345–47, 349, 351–52, 354, 360, 367, 369, 376–77, 385–86, 393–94, 396, 404–06, 420–22, 440, 450, 462, 486–87, 506, 523, 530–31, 586
 Kerr (Ker), William, 3rd Earl of Lothian, 369, 405, 440, 443, 450–51, 460–63, 476, 482, 486, 488, 509–10, 569, 647, 656–57, 683, 688, 692
 Keyser, Hendrik de, 312, 332
 Khunrath, Heinrich, 620
 Kilbye, Richard, 302
 Killigrew, Sir Peter, 745
 Killigrew, Sir Thomas, 703, 745
 Kimchi, Joseph ben Isaac, 405
 Kincardine, 2nd Earl of (see Bruce, Alexander)
 King, John, Bishop of London, 335
 Kinner, Cyprian, 485
 Kinnoul, 1st Earl of (see Hay, George)

 Kircher, Athanasius, 39, 468–71, 483, 539, 561–64, 571, 598, 621, 637, 652, 667, 671–72, 679, 706, 719–20, 748
 Kirk, Reverend Robert, 771–72
 Kirkwood, Jack, 662
 Knolles, Sir William, 128–29
 Knorr von Rosenroth, Christian, 666, 695, 712, 720
 Knox, John, Presbyterian Reformer, 131, 144–46, 149–50, 156, 161–70, 178, 182, 194, 201, 403, 422, 790
 Knox, John, Provost of St. Andrews, 313
 Kosciusko, Thaddeus, 693

 La Costa, 591
 Lafayette, Marie Joseph, Marquis de, 793
 Lamberton, William, Bishop of St. Andrews, 89–91
 Lambi, John Baptista, 357
 Langdale, Sir Marmaduke, 535–36, 554
 Laud, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, 164, 322–23, 337–39, 373–75, 386, 388, 400–01, 415–23, 426, 435–36, 438, 441, 444, 446, 448–49, 452, 456, 465–66, 505, 537
 Lauderdale, 1st Duke of (see Maitland, John)
 Lauderdale, Duchess of (see Murray, Elizabeth)
 Lavater, Diethelm and Johann Kaspar, 793
 Lawrie, Alexander, 301
 Le Blon, Michel, 524, 532
 Le Clerc, Jean, 784
 Lefèvre d'Étaples, Jacques, 134–36, 141–42, 151
 Lefèvre de la Boderie, Guy, 179
 Lefèvre de la Boderie, Nicolas, 179, 184
 Leibniz, Gottfried Wilhelm, 666–67
 Lennox, Charles, Duc de Aubigny and 1st Duke of Richmond, 781
 Lennox, Duke of Lennox and Richmond (see Stuart, Charles)
 Leo X, Pope, 132–33
 Leo Hebraeus (Judah Abravanel), 173, 208–10, 272
 Leon, Abraham, 701
 Leon, Jacob Jehudah, 454–55, 457, 467–68, 485, 490, 540, 546,

- 548–49, 551, 560, 626, 668,
671–72, 698–705, 711, 745, 749,
771–72
- Leon, Solomon Jehudah, 706, 711
- Leonardo da Vinci, 132–33
- Leslie, Sir Alexander, General, 441,
463–64, 476
- Leslie, Bishop of Orkney, 655
- Leslie, John, 6th Earl of Rothes,
418–19, 438
- Leslie, John, 7th Earl of Rothes, 647,
650
- Levi, Tadeus, 359
- Libavius, Andreas, 297, 304
- Lichtenberg, Johann, 293
- Liddell, Dr. Duncan, 281–83
- Lilly, William, 481, 610, 614–15,
682n.39, 768
- Lindsay, Alexander, 2nd Earl of
Balcarres, 459–60, 464, 472, 476,
482, 486, 488, 495, 508, 510–11,
517–19, 537, 544–45, 567, 572–73,
579–80, 586, 623–25, 628, 782
- Lindsay, Colin, 3rd Earl of Balcarres,
623, 742, 762–63, 765–66, 782–84
- Lindsay, David, Bishop of Edinburgh,
418
- Lindsay, David, 1st Earl of Balcarres,
317, 328, 421–22, 443, 486–87,
506, 508
- Lindsay, John, Lord Menmuir, 317,
327–28, 421
- Lindsay, Sir Ralph, 92
- Lindsay, Sir Walter, 137, 149
- Lindsay, Sophia, 663, 685
- Lindsay, Sophia, Lady Moray, 486,
511
- Lindsay of Edzell, Sir David, 325,
327–28
- Lindsay of Pittscottie, Robert,
139–40
- Littler, Henry, 477
- Locke, John, 601, 720
- Loew, Jacob, 487
- London, George, 777
- Lothian, 1st and 3rd Earls of
(see Kerr, Mark and William)
- Louis IX, King of France, 81
- Louis XIII, King of France, 442, 460
- Louis XIV, King of France, 623, 636,
641, 650, 707, 717, 753, 762, 764,
782
- Loutherbourg, Philippe Jacques de,
793
- Lowe, Dr. Peter, 226–26
- Lucas, Thomas, 758
- Lull, Ramon, 70–78, 91, 114–15, 118,
126, 134–37, 140–43, 157–61, 194,
202, 211, 250, 252, 259, 272, 281,
294, 297, 315–16, 330, 357–58,
360–61, 377, 398, 445, 462, 469,
500, 506, 524, 553–54, 563, 617,
621–23, 686, 695, 714–16
- Lumley, Henry, 264
- Luria, Isaac, 712
- Lusignan, Henry de, King of
Jerusalem, 75
- Lychton, Henry of, 105
- Lydgate, John, 105, 110
- Maccabeus, Judas (and Maccabees), 94,
96, 102, 114–16, 125–26, 130, 147,
153, 208, 300–01, 310, 525
- Mackay, Hugh, General, 775
- Mackenzie, Anna, Countess Balcarres,
518, 580, 583, 585, 627
- Mackenzie, Sir George, 724–26,
738–39, 742, 754, 764, 769
- Mackenzie, Kenneth, 427, 743
- Mackenzie, Kenneth, 4th Earl of
Seaforth, 764
- Macklain, John, 610
- Maclean, Sir John, 542
- Macolo (McColl), James and John,
297–98, 305, 332, 343, 363
- Madeleine of Valois, Queen of
Scotland, 140
- Magalotti, Lorenzo, 517n.225
- Maier, Michael, 283, 289, 294–95,
305, 345, 358, 539, 694
- Maimonides, 49, 64
- Mainwaring, Henry, Colonel, 477–79,
481, 500
- Maitland, John, 2nd Earl and 1st
Duke of Lauderdale, 450n.7, 464,
472, 489–90, 508, 510, 560, 568,
571–72, 576, 582, 584–89, 597, 610,
623, 627, 631, 642–43, 646–47,
655–58, 670, 681, 683–84, 688,
690–92, 700, 723–24, 730, 750, 780
- Maitland, Richard, 779–80
- Major, John, 135–36, 141, 202
- Malcolm III, King of Scotland, 277
- Mansart, François, 650
- Mar, 6th, 10th, and 11th Earls of
(see Erskine, John)
- Mar, Countess of (see Murray,
Annabela)

- Mar, David de, 101
 Marafiotto, Girolamo, 245
 Marcelline, George, 272
 Marci of Kronland, Marcus, 468–69, 560
 Maria the Jewess, 27
 Marie de Medici, Queen of France, 276, 373, 392, 453
 Marr, John, 265, 296, 334, 404
 Marsh, Narcissus, Archbishop of Dublin, 707
 Marshall, Edward, 625, 628
 Martel, Charles, 80, 108–09, 116, 153, 308, 341, 470, 480, 682
 Martin, Thomas, 576–78
 Martyne, Moses (Mogyne), 140
 Marvell, Andrew, 655–56, 667, 688–93
 Mary II, Princess of Orange and Queen of Britain, 757, 766, 777
 Mary, Princess, daughter of “Winter Queen,” 456, 458
 Mary of Guise, Queen of Scotland, 140, 146–52, 156–67, 196, 199, 205, 439
 Mary of Modena, Duchess of York and Queen of Britain, 727, 757, 779
 Mary Queen of Scots, 146–47, 167–78, 182, 185, 193, 199, 204–05, 218, 248, 251, 272–73, 299, 324, 754
 Mash’alla, 31
 Masius, Andreas, 179, 256
 Massonet, Dr. Peter, 567–68, 572
 Mathers, MacGregor, ix, xii
 Matheoli (Matthiolis de Perusinus), 716
 Maude, Richard, 401
 Mauvissière, Michele de Castelnau de, 202
 Maxwell, James, 287, 289–94, 304, 309–10, 349–50, 487, 721
 Maxwell, Dr. William, 392–93, 477, 482, 485, 507–08
 May, Hugh, 629–30, 654
 Mayerne, Dr., 409n.139
 Mazararin, Jules, Cardinal, 463–64, 472, 475
 Mead, Joseph, 381
 Medici, Cosimo II de, Grand Duke of Tuscany, 297
 Melchisedek, 245
 Melfort, 4th Earl of (see Drummond, John)
 Melos, Don Francesco de, 701
 Melville, Andrew, 182, 185, 228–29
 Melville, James, courtier to Mary Queen of Scots, 173
 Melville, James, Presbyterian Reformer, 182, 197, 201
 Melville, Sir James, courtier to James VI, 216
 Menasseh ben Israel, 454, 457, 467, 527–29, 531–38, 606, 623, 671, 701
 Mendes, David Franco, 704
 Mennes, John, 389, 391–92, 441, 448
 Mercator, Gerardus, 659
 Merlin, 271, 293
 Mersenne, Marin, 392, 399
 Metatron, 359, 620
 Michaelangelo Buonarroti, 635
 Middleton, John, 1st Earl of
 Middleton, 486, 511, 518, 529, 537, 540–41, 543–44, 546, 554, 647, 733–34
 Middleton, Charles, 2nd Earl of
 Middleton, 783
 Middleton, John, 3rd Earl of
 Middleton, 783
 Milburn, John, 147–48
 Milton, John, 449, 492–94, 529, 534, 616, 688
 Molay, Jacques de, 57, 59, 75, 91, 341
 Monk (Monck), George, 1st Duke of Albemarle, 510–11, 518, 571, 573–76, 580–90, 595, 617, 620, 623, 628–29, 640–41, 653, 678, 681, 742–43, 764, 767
 Montague, Sir Henry, 340
 Montaigne, Michel de, 155
 Montano, Benito Arias, 180, 256, 272, 300, 352, 370, 373, 498, 553
 Montereul, Jean de, 472, 475, 518–19
 Montesquieu, Charles Louis de
 Secondat, Baron de, 793
 Montgomerie, Sir James, 775–76
 Montgomerie, Sir Robert, 544
 Montgomery, Alexander, 8th Earl of Eglinton, 688
 Montgomery, Jacques de, 149
 Montjosieu, Louis de, 299–300
 Moray, Sir Robert, 212, 299, 301, 327–28, 369, 393, 422, 435, 442–43, 450–51, 459–64, 468–72, 474–78, 481–82, 485–86, 488–90, 495–96, 499–501, 504, 507–08, 510–11, 517–23, 530, 537, 540, 543–48,

- 551–76, 579–80, 582–89, 595,
603–11, 617–19, 621–27, 630–31,
637–40, 642–44, 646–47, 650–52,
655–68, 670–71, 677, 679, 683–90,
693, 695, 700–01, 704, 706, 708,
710, 712–13, 715, 722, 724,
726–27, 730–31, 733, 742, 748,
750, 778, 782–83, 787
- Moray, Sir William, 630–31
- More, Henry, 602–03, 625, 677, 712
- More, Sir Thomas, 138
- Morestel, Pierre, 361
- Moritz, Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel,
305–06
- Morsius, Joachim, 345, 347, 356
- Morteira, Saul Levi, 454
- Morton, 4th Earl of (see Douglas,
James)
- Moses, 15, 47, 52, 62, 67, 89, 192,
289, 310, 359, 364, 436, 596,
620
- Moses, Abraham, 546
- Moses de Leon, 50, 52, 54, 56
- Mozart, Wolfgang Amadeus, 679, 793
- Muhammad, 30
- Müller, Dr. Daniel, 282, 357, 393,
506
- Murray, Annabella, Countess of Mar,
177, 186
- Murray, Elizabeth, Countess of Dysart
and Duchess of Lauderdale,
571–72, 576, 597, 688, 701
- Murray, Sir James, 261, 312, 317–18,
335, 363, 374, 387–88, 391, 401,
404, 414, 416–19, 424, 429
- Murray, Sir Thomas, 389
- Murray, William, 1st Earl of Dysart,
389–90, 441, 448–50, 450, 455,
463, 472, 476, 482, 488, 509, 511,
545, 571–72
- Murray of Kilbaberton, Sir James,
249, 261
- Musaphia, Rabbi, 626
- Musculus, Wolganus, 205
- Mylius, Johan, 398
- Mylne, Alexander, 404, 408, 433–34
- Mylne, James, 429
- Mylne, John (fl. 1585), 207, 215, 246,
574
- Mylne, John (d. 1621), 320–21, 403,
574
- Mylne, John (d. 1657), 391, 402, 403,
420, 433, 436–37, 451, 478, 485,
512–13, 573–76
- Mylne, John (d. 1667), 428, 450, 574,
582, 608, 647, 780
- Mylne, Robert, 663–64, 688, 724, 740,
764, 775
- Mylne, Robert, Anglican minister, 788
- Mylne, Thomas, 788n.191
- Naamah, 110
- Naghralla, Samuel Ibn and Yusuf,
35–38
- Nahamides, 83
- Napier, Alexander, 223
- Napier, Sir Archibald, 253, 335, 363,
386
- Napier, Dr. Richard, 220, 252–53,
286, 305, 361
- Napier, Robert, 305, 357, 393
- Napier of Merchiston, John, 220–21,
223–24, 226, 230–31, 246, 253, 258,
262, 265, 282–83, 289–90, 294, 306,
311, 316, 327, 513, 523, 599, 612,
719, 721
- Naudé, Gabriel, 359–60
- Nebuchadnezzar, 12
- Neale, Sir Paul, 605
- Neile, Richard, Dean of Westminster,
269
- Newton, Sir Adam, 262, 394
- Newton, Isaac, x, 1, 6, 609
- Nicholas, Sir Edward, 511, 536, 576, 579
- Nicholas of Cusa, 135, 220, 367, 562
- Nicholas of Lyra, 125–26, 553
- Niklaes, Hendrik, 179–81, 254–55, 400,
489, 677
- Noah, 67–68, 79, 110
- Norfolk, 8th Duke of (see Howard,
Thomas)
- Norry, Sir George, 292
- Northumberland, Earl of, 483
- Norton, Thomas, 294, 506
- Nostradamus, 161, 291–92, 445, 692,
721
- Novikov, Nicolai, 793
- Oates, Titus, 718–19
- O'Brien, William (2nd Earl of Inchiquin),
734
- Oetinger, Friedrich Christoph, 793
- Ogilby, John, 632, 704, 744
- Oldenburg, Henry, 604, 608–09, 646,
654, 667, 674–77, 694–95, 699,
701, 708–10, 712–13, 716, 721
- Ormonde, 1st Duke of (see Butler,
James)

- Orrery, 1st Earl of (see Boyle, Roger)
 Osborne, Francis, 279, 332
 Osiris, 291
 Otway, Thomas, 732–33, 736, 738, 744, 746
 Oughtred, William, 597–98
 Overton, Richard, 535–36
 Oxford, 1st Earl of (see Harley, Robert)

 Paddy, Sir William, 305
 Paine, Thomas, 793
 Palissy, Bernard, 258
 Palladio, Andrea, 217, 269, 307–09, 340, 710
 Paniter (Panter), Patrick, 129, 132–33
 Paps, Thomas, 788
 Paracelsus, Phillipus Aureolus, 289, 291–92, 360, 377, 487, 713–14, 721, 748, 790
 Pariente, Solomon, 644, 734
 Parker, Samuel, Bishop of London, 651–52, 676, 688–89
 Parmenides, 659
 Partington, 355
 Pasqually, Martines de, 793
 Patricius (Patrizzi), Francesco, 289
 Paul of Burgos, 153, 553
 Pembroke, 3rd Earl of (see Howard, Thomas)
 Penn, William, 728–29, 754, 775
 Pennington, John, 368
 Pepys, Samuel, 661–62
 Perkins, William, 204–05
 Perth, 1st and 2nd Dukes of (see Drummond, James)
 Peter I (de Lusignan), King of Cyprus, 101
 Peter I (“The Great”), Czar of Russia, 781
 Peter of Celle, Bishop, 47
 Petre, Edward, 757
 Petty, Sir William, 654
 Philip II, King of Spain, 180–81, 224, 250–51, 256
 Philip III, King of Spain, 251, 348
 Philip IV, King of Spain, 351, 412
 Philip IV (the Fair), King of France, 57–59, 73, 89, 116, 213
 Philip of Tripoli, 117
 Philo Judaeus, 14–16, 21–22, 32, 34, 107, 155, 208, 265, 361
 Pico della Mirandola, 134, 136, 220, 265, 289, 478, 481, 553, 620
 Piso, Isaac Israel, 592
 Pistorius, Johannes, 498
 Pitcairne, Dr. Archibald, 769
 Plantin, Christophe, 178–81, 223, 254–56, 300, 304, 319, 756
 Plato, 46, 67, 118, 135, 187, 289, 307, 359, 436, 634
 Plato of Tivoli, 46
 Platt, Sir Hugh, 206–07, 257, 259, 497
 Plot, Dr. Robert, 733, 739, 748–51
 Poleman, Joachim, 600–01
 Politius, Dr., 295
 Pope, Alexander, 793
 Porta, Giovanni Battista, 207, 650, 727
 Porte, M. de la, 642
 Portland, 1st Earl of (see Bentinck, William)
 Pory, John, 380
 Postel, Guillaume, 142, 172, 179, 256, 272, 293, 299, 620, 714, 721, 727
 Powell, Thomas, 502–04
 Pratt, Sir Roger, 654–55
 Preston, Sir Richard, Lord Dingwall, 294
 Price, John, 583
 Prynne, William, 424, 465–66, 534, 537
 Ptolemy, 185
 Pythagoras, 15–16, 21, 36, 46, 67, 108, 135, 233, 265, 272, 307, 398, 436, 478, 659, 673

 Queensbury, 1st Duke of (see Douglas, William)

 Rainsford, Charles, General, 427
 Ramsay, Chevalier Andrew Michael, 2, 82, 85, 92, 97, 112, 131, 151, 171, 512n.211, 575, 581–82, 585, 614, 791–93
 Ramsay, David, 377, 380–82, 390–91, 393, 395–98, 397–98, 409, 431–32, 436–37, 442, 445, 454, 456–58, 467, 481, 483–85, 500, 505, 515–16, 537, 582, 750
 Ramsay, James, 397
 Ramsay (Ramesey), William, 393, 483, 515–16, 614
 Ramus, Peter, 398
 Raphael Sanzio, 634
 Rathborne, Aaron, 307
 Ravius, Christian, 457
 Raymond, Jon, 672
 Reid, Thomas, 283, 396
 Rembrandt van Rijn, 531

- Reresby, Sir John, 778
 Reuchlin, Johannes (Capnio), 136,
 155, 182–83, 265, 365, 435, 487,
 498, 553, 652, 721
 Richelieu, Armand Jean du Plessis,
 Cardinal de, 442, 460–61, 714
 Ridley, 759, 761
 Ripley, George, 506
 Rittangel, Johannes Stefanus, 457
 Rivers, Earl of (see Savage, Thomas)
 Robert I (the Bruce), King of
 Scotland, 77–78, 85, 89–98, 102,
 109, 114, 128, 130, 148, 725, 755
 Robert II, King of Scotland, 101, 104
 Robert III, King of Scotland, 105
 Robert of Normandy, 276
 Robison, John, 785–87
 Rosencreutz, Christian (C.R.), 287–89,
 296, 307, 342–43, 500, 721
 Rothes, 6th Earl of (see Leslie, John)
 Rothes, 7th Earl of (see Leslie, John)
 Roytell, John, 161, 163
 Rubens, Sir Peter Paul, 391, 401,
 432–33, 527
 Rudolph II, Holy Roman Emperor,
 282–83, 348
 Rupert, Prince, 617, 624, 677
 Rutherford, Andrew, 1st Earl of
 Teviot, 643–46
 Rutherford, Samuel, 488–89
 Ruthven, George, 238
 Ruthven, Patrick, alchemist, 283, 397,
 506–08
 Ruthven, Patrick, royalist agent, 524
 Ruthven, Sir Patrick, General, 397,
 410, 441
 Ruthven, Sir Thomas, 506
 Ruthven, William, 506

 Saadya Gaon, 33–34
 Sackville, Sir Thomas, 170
 Sacrobosco, Johannes de, 173, 181,
 265
 Sadler, John, 445–46
 St. Albans, 1st Earl of (see Jermyn,
 Henry)
 St. Andrew, 97
 St. Clair (Sinclair) family, *passim*
 St. Clair, Henry, 114
 St. Clair, Henry, Dean of Glasgow,
 142, 168
 St. Clair, John, Dean of Restalgrig,
 165
 St. Clair, Lord, 584, 764

 St. Clair, Sir Oliver, 145–46
 St. Clair, William, Earl of Caithness
 and Orkney, 113–24
 St. Clair of Roslin, James, 642–43,
 645–46, 768
 St. Clair of Roslin, James, son of
 above, 768
 St. Clair of Roslin, Sir William
 (d. 1584), 110, 195, 236, 239
 St. Clair of Roslin, Sir William
 (d. 1650), 386–88, 401–02, 429–30,
 433–34, 437, 472
 St. Clair of Roslin, William (d. 1620's),
 236–37, 315, 386–87, 788
 St. Martin, Louis Claude de, 793
 St. Paul, 18, 290–91
 St. Thomas of Acre
 (Thomas à Becket), 81
 Saladin, 48, 375
 Salian, Gerard, 533
 Salisbury, 1st Earl of (see Cecil, Robert)
 Samber, Robert, 627
 Sanclemente, Ambassador, 252
 Sandilands, Sir James, 1st Lord
 Torpichen, 147, 149, 151, 156,
 161–62, 167–69, 174–76, 185, 212
 Sandilands, John James, 162, 167–69,
 175
 Sangallo, Antonio de, 269
 Sankey, Edward, 479
 Sankey, Richard, 477, 479
 Sasportas, Jacob, 671
 Saubert, Johan, 671–72
 Sautre, Brother John de, 87
 Savage, Thomas, Earl of Rivers, 654,
 662
 Savasorda (see Hiyya, Abraham Bar)
 Scaliger, Joseph, 172–73, 299–301,
 340, 405, 445, 553, 617, 621, 727
 Scamozzi, Vincenzo, 308, 340
 Scarborough, Sir Charles, 726–27
 Schaw, Alexander, 363
 Schaw, William, 158, 196–202,
 206–08, 214, 216, 218, 221–22,
 224–25, 229, 231–40, 243, 260,
 269, 314, 317, 322, 324, 327, 333,
 346, 355, 363, 365, 374, 383, 387,
 421, 434, 632, 647, 659, 673
 Scheffer, Johan, 717
 Schröter, Dr. Johann (?), 713
 Schweigardt, Theophilus, 361, 422
 Scogan, John, 362
 Scot, Michael, 63–66, 70, 98, 117,
 127, 148, 252, 358

- Scot, Patrick, 329–30, 357–59
 Scot, Reginald, 227
 Scot, Robert le, 86, 90, 93
 Scot, Thomas, 90
 Scota, 62, 69, 85, 89, 108, 184–85, 204, 236, 240, 291, 322, 341, 578, 790
 Scott, Sir Walter, 66, 228
 Scotus, John Duns, 69–70, 75, 116–17, 126–27, 136, 405, 617
 Scrymgeour of Myres, John, 140
 Seaforth, 4th Earl of (see Mackenzie, Kenneth)
 Seale, Robert, 255
 Seale, Thomas, 255
 Seget, Thomas, 523n.11
 Selden, John, 360
 Sendivogius, Michael, 281–82, 284, 303, 522–24, 721
 Serlio, Sebastian, 258, 269, 340, 370, 388, 422, 667–68
 Serrarius, Peter, 549, 674–75
 Servi, Constantino de, 274
 Seth, 108, 190, 340, 516, 691, 706
 Seton, Alexander, alchemist, 281–82, 284, 303, 487, 522–23
 Seton, Alexander, 1st Earl of Dunfermline, 198, 206–08, 212, 226, 228–29, 232, 234–35, 237–38, 240, 277, 295, 311–18, 335, 340, 363
 Seton, Alexander, 3rd Earl of Dunfermline, 464, 472, 485, 510
 Seton, Alexander, Guardian of Torpichen, 98–99
 Seton, Charles, 2nd Earl of Dunfermline, 647
 Seton, Sir David, 175, 198
 Seton, George, 3rd Earl of Winton, 312–15, 417–18
 Seton, George, 5th Lord Seton, 163, 168–69, 171, 198–99, 207
 Seton, Lady Janet, 148
 Seton, Sir John, 224
 Seton, Robert, 6th Lord Seton and 1st Earl of Winton
 Seton, Sophia, 317
 Seton (Montgomery), family, 113, 124, 148
 Seton of Gordon, Alexander, 112
 Sexby, Edward, Colonel, 535
 Shadwell, Thomas, 708–09, 758, 779, 790
 Shaftesbury, 1st Earl of (see Ashley Cooper, Anthony)
 Shakespeare, William, 279–80, 324
 Shapira, Nathan, 549–50
 Sharp, James, Archbishop of St. Andrews, 723
 Sheeres, Henry, 735
 Sheldon, Gilbert, Archbishop of Canterbury, 635, 642, 658–62, 665, 692, 698, 700–01
 Shelley, Sir Richard, 163
 Shelley, Percy Bysshe, 163
 Shirley, James, 424
 Sibbald, Sir Robert, 726–27
 Sidney, Sir Philip, 203–06, 253
 Simeon Ben Yohai, 55
 Simon Magus, 493
 Skelton, John, 362
 Skytte, Bengt, 599, 603, 605, 608, 666
 Smith, James, 389
 Smith, James, architect, 724, 740, 755, 763, 775
 Socrates, 67, 267, 659
 Solomon, King of Israel, *passim*
 Sorbière, Samuel de, 565n.162, 583, 608, 623
 Sparrow, John, 486–88
 Speed, William, 400
 Spens, James, 397
 Spencer, Sir Edward, 527–28
 Spenser, Edmund, 273
 Spicer, William, 246
 Spinola, Ambrogio, 350, 377
 Spinoza, Benedict (Baruch), 549, 674, 701, 713
 Spottiswoode, John, Archbishop of St. Andrews, 323, 419, 438
 Sprat, Thomas, Bishop of Rochester, 583, 623–24, 639, 646, 680, 694
 Stanislaus I (Leszczyński), King of Poland, 793
 Starck, Johann August, 582
 Starkey, John, “Eirenaeus Philalethes,” 616–17
 Stephen de Stapelbrugge, 90
 Stewart, Alexander, Bishop of St. Andrews, 133, 135–36
 Stewart, Lord James, 141
 Stewart, James, Earl of Moray, 177
 Stewart, John, poet, 322
 Stewart, Lord John, 171
 Stewart, John, Duke of Albany, 132
 Stewart, John, 1st Earl of Traquair, 402, 405, 416–17, 438–39, 450, 472, 476, 486
 Stewart of Darnley, Sir John, 112

- Sthael, Peter, 601, 720
 Stickells, Robert, 245–47
 Stillingfleet, Edward, Bishop of Worcester, 771–72
 Stirling, 1st and 3rd Earls of (see Alexander, Henry and William)
 Stoke, Brother John de, 87
 Stone, John (d. 1618), 330
 Stone, John, 436, 473, 628
 Stone, Nicholas, 269, 312–14, 330–34, 394, 408, 425, 429, 436, 472, 628
 Story, Abraham, 699, 703, 710
 Strachan of Thornton, Sir Alexander, 428, 433, 436
 Strafford, 1st Earl of (see Wentworth, Thomas)
 Strong, Edward, 746
 Struthers, Lionel, 282
 Stuart, Charles, 3rd Duke of Lennox and Richmond, 617
 Stuart, Charles Edward, the “Young Pretender,” 277, 724, 776, 782, 784
 Stuart, Elizabeth, “Winter Queen” of Bohemia, 278–80, 283, 286, 289–92, 342, 345, 349–50, 375, 382, 408, 533–34, 542, 579, 587, 617
 Stuart, Esmé, Seigneur d’Aubigny and First Duke of Lennox, 192–96, 262, 364
 Stuart, Henry, Prince of Wales, 194, 224, 230–31, 248–49, 262, 264, 270–80, 283, 289, 345, 372, 394
 Stuart, Ludovick, Second Duke of Lennox and Richmond, 262, 333, 348, 364
 Stuart, Mary, Princess of Orange, 408, 453–54
 Stuart, Robert, Lord of Albany (Aubigny), 342
 Stubbe, Henry, 694
 Studion, Simon, 280, 283–85, 362, 376
 Suffolk, 3rd Earl of (see Howard, James)
 Suger, Abbot of Saint-Denis, 44, 47–48
 Surenhuys, Wilhem, 707
 Swedenborg, Emanuel, ix–xii, 49, 793
 Swift, Jonathan, 61–62, 69, 73, 94, 103, 164, 269, 394, 577, 622, 627, 643, 683, 758–62, 769, 780–81, 784, 787–93
 Sylvester, Joshua, 187, 212
 Talbot, Richard, 1st Earl of Tyrconnell, 760–61, 768
 Talbot, Richard, 3rd Earl of Tyrconnell, 761n.81
 Talman, William, 777
 Tasso, Torquato, 275–76, 491
 Temple, Sir Richard, 610
 Temple, Sir William, 787–88
 Templo, Solomon Jehudah Leon, 771
 Tertullian, 713
 Tessin, Carl Gustaf, 575, 717, 776
 Tessin, Bernard, 641, 643, 735n.219
 Tessin, Hans Ewald, xi, 513, 571, 575–76, 582, 641, 643, 645, 717, 735
 Tessin, Nicodemus, 717
 Teviot, 1st Earl of (see Rutherford, Andrew)
 Texeira, Abraham, 533, 540
 Theodore I, King of Corsica, 793
 Thom, Alexander, 750
 Thomas of Erceldoune, “The Rhymer,” 293, 554
 Thompson, John, 698
 Thornborough, John, Bishop of Worcester, 306, 348, 357, 447, 449
 Thorowgood, Thomas, 606
 Thorpe, John, 247, 370
 Throckmorton, Ambassador, 167–68
 Thurloe, John, 523, 537, 574
 Tibbon, Samuel Ibn, 64
 Tichborne, Robert, 616
 Titus, Roman Emperor, 19, 375, 471, 637
 Toland, John, 791
 Tonge, Ezerel, 625, 641–42, 645–46, 710, 718–22, 731
 Topsell, Edward, 268–69
 Torpichen, 1st Lord (see Sandilands, James)
 Torrentius (Jan Symonsz van der Beck), 382, 545
 Townshend, Aurelian, 407, 410
 Traquair, 1st Earl of (see Stewart, John)
 Treloar, Thomas, 669, 672–74, 709
 Tremellius, John Immanuel, 154, 208
 Tresham, Sir Thomas (Grand Prior of England), 162
 Tresham, Sir Thomas, 244–47, 370
 Trithemius, Johannes, 220, 256, 293, 360, 597, 727
 Tudor, Margaret, Queen of Scotland, 127, 132

- Tudor, Mary, Queen of England, 161–62, 251
- Turner, Dr. Robert, 616
- Tweeddale, 2nd Earl of (see Hay, John)
- Tycho Brahe, 217–21, 223, 281, 289, 346, 368, 560, 565–66, 612
- Tyrconnell, 1st and 3rd Earls of (see Talbot, Richard)
- Urban VI, Pope, 103
- Urquhart of Cromarty, Sir Thomas, 513–16, 715
- Urquhart of Lethintie, Patrick, 429
- Ursinus, Johannes Heinrich, 679
- Valerianus, 620
- Vaninus, 722
- Vasari, Giorgio, 367
- Vaughan, Henry, 447, 495–96, 501–02, 505, 556–57, 622, 653, 685, 687
- Vaughan, Rebecca, 557
- Vaughan, Richard, Earl of Carbury, 612, 614
- Vaughan, Thomas (“Eugenius Philalethes”), 287n.165, 470, 495–500, 502, 504, 522, 524–26, 535, 556–57, 568, 596, 599, 603, 605, 609, 611, 614, 616–17, 622, 650–53, 658, 660, 666, 693–94, 790
- Vaughan, William, 377–80, 382, 384
- Vautrollier, Thomas, 204–05
- Vaux, Edward, 4th Lord Vaux of Harrowden, 353
- Veitch of Dawick, Sir John, 450–51, 458, 631
- Vere, Aubrey de, 20th Earl of Oxford, 617
- Verona, Antonio Maria de, 454–54
- Villalpando, Juan Bautista, 250–51, 256, 331–32, 337, 352, 370, 454, 490, 549, 553, 570, 672, 699–700, 704–05
- Villars, Abbé de Montfaucon de, 713–15, 728, 790
- Villiers, George, 1st Duke of Buckingham, 194, 318, 329, 350–55, 365–69, 377, 381, 385, 389, 483–84, 489, 505, 567, 570
- Villiers, George, 2nd Duke of Buckingham, 509–11, 583, 595, 611, 615–16, 619–20, 629–30, 644, 651–55, 680–81, 685, 688, 694, 696, 700, 719, 722, 729–30, 758, 761, 778, 790
- Violet, Thomas, 591
- Virgil, 779–80
- Vitruvius Pollio, Marcus, 111, 217, 219, 221, 258, 263, 266, 334, 340, 366, 411, 462, 667, 703, 710, 780
- Voltaire, François Marie Arouet de, 793
- Wallace, William, master mason, 313–14, 317, 374, 388
- Wallace, Sir William, 87, 89, 262, 554
- Waller, Edmund, 474
- Wallis, John, 625
- Walsh, Antoine Vincent, 782
- Walsh, James, 769, 782
- Walter, Dr. Balthasar, 487
- Walter of Clifton, Brother, 90
- Walter the Steward, 80
- Walton, Dr. Brian, 570
- Waltoun, John de, 106
- Washington, George, 793
- Waters, Robert, 710
- Watson, Thomas, 205
- Webb, John, 458, 473, 509, 570, 628–29, 631, 640, 648–50, 654, 665, 678–79, 703
- Wedderburn, Robert, 151–54, 156
- Weemes, John, 405, 408
- Weldon, Sir Anthony, 193, 323
- Wentworth, Thomas, 1st Earl of Strafford, 430, 448
- Wharton, George, 481
- Whitney, Geoffrey, 319
- Wilkins, John, Bishop of Chester, 569, 597–99, 603–05, 625, 644, 693, 727, 748
- William of Genoa, 275
- William II, Prince of Orange, 453–55, 467, 470, 545
- William III, Prince of Orange and King of Britain, 758, 762–83 *passim*
- Williams, John, Bishop of London, 370–71
- Williamson, Joseph, 716, 719, 734
- Willis, John, 477, 715–16
- Willis, Sir Richard, 576
- Winton, 1st and 3rd Earls of (see Seton, Robert and George)
- Worthington, Dr. John, 560, 600, 602–05

- Wotton, Sir Henry, 365–69, 485,
 522, 598
 Wren, Christopher, Dean of Windsor
 598, 675
 Wren, Sir Christopher, 30, 47, 256,
 512, 568, 597–99, 601, 605,
 630–32, 635, 640, 646, 648, 650,
 654, 664–65, 667, 671, 675,
 687, 698–99, 703–06, 709–10,
 716–17, 727, 729, 731, 746–48,
 776–79, 781
 Wren, Matthew, Dean of Windsor and
 Bishop of Ely, 598, 681
 Yeats, William Butler, ix, xii
 Yllan, Juan de, 675
 Young, Nicholas, 704
 Young, Peter, 178, 212
 Younge, Walter, 353–54
 Zeamons, David, 610
 Zerubbabel, 12, 20, 167, 590, 731
 Zevi, Sabbatai, x, 1, 674–77,
 701–02
 Ziegler, Philip, 380–82, 393, 454
 Zoroaster, 135, 361, 679
 Zozimos, 27, 293